

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN his recent book, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*,¹ which surveys the true significance of Righteousness, Holiness, and Love in God, the Rev. Norman H. SNAITH, M.A. (Oxon.), Tutor in Old Testament Language and Literature in Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds, examines the New Testament use of these great words. His main contention is that they have been interpreted wrongly in the Greek tradition and given a Greek connotation instead of the Hebrew tradition, with an Old Testament meaning. It is true that the language is Greek, not Hebrew, and that the Incarnation has made a difference. But all the same the Old Testament is the foundation of the New. Our tutors to Christ are Moses and the Prophets, not Plato and Aristotle.

The generally accepted approach to the New Testament is to insist in the first place that the New Testament is written in the common (*koine*) Greek of the period, and forthwith to interpret it much as any other Hellenistic book. This involved the study of Hellenistic Greek in the inscriptions, the papyri, and in such Hellenistic writers as Polybius and Josephus. It has not involved, to any marked extent, the study of the Greek Bible, the Septuagint, which for four hundred years was the Bible of the Christian Church.

This is all right so far as grammar and syntax are concerned. But the neglect of the Septuagint from the point of view of the meaning of the words has been serious. It is becoming more and more clear that considerable attention must be paid to the way in which the Septuagint translators rendered the Hebrew words. The Greek word in the Septuagint tends to carry the meaning of the original Hebrew word, and not its own meaning as a normal Greek word. In many cases this is not of great account, but the cases where it does make a very great deal of difference are precisely those cases where we are dealing with the distinctive ideas of the Old Testament.

¹ Westminster Press, Philadelphia; \$2.75.

These ultimately are the only cases that matter, and a close study of the facts makes it clear that the old procedure, whereby the study of a word in the Greek New Testament began with Plato and Aristotle, or even with Homer and the tragedians, could be entirely misleading, and might be even erroneous. It is essential, especially if the word in question is a religious word, to begin with the Septuagint and to notice to what extent the Septuagint used the word as the equivalent of the original Hebrew, and, next, to see to what extent the New Testament usage in any writer is covered by this Septuagint use.

The extent to which the Greek of the Septuagint is really Hebrew-Greek has not been recognized in time past as it ought to have been recognized. Particularly is this so since the medium through which Old Testament ideas came to the Christians in the first place was Greek. Incalculable harm has been done by this neglect. It began very early, as early as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and it arose from the fact that these scholars were Hellenists first and Christians second. It was furthered by the fact that all men until Jerome tended to read the Greek Bible as a Greek book and with Hellenistic eyes.

This lasted till the fifth century, and both learned and unlearned were equally at fault. They interpreted the words as Greek words, just as if Greek had been the original tongue. Later this was done for centuries with the Latin Bible, and it has been the fate of the Bible in every language into which it has been translated. The result of this has been that from a very early stage Christianity itself has tended to suffer from a translation out of the Prophets and into Plato. Later, the master was Cicero, and with the Renaissance, Aristotle. Plato, indeed, has been made to be 'divine,' and Aristotle 'the master of them that know.' The tragedy of Christian theology through the years is the extent to which these statements are true

in the matter of 'knowing Christ.' The Reformation was an attempt to restore the original Hebrew setting of the gospel, and, theologically, to break the shackles of the Greeks. The revival of classical learning was a reshackling of the Faith, to which many of the Reformers themselves succumbed.

That, then, is the main thesis of this argument—that the Old Testament ideas coming over the bridge of the Septuagint to the New Testament suffered a sea change, were clothed with Greek meanings instead of the Hebrew meanings they definitely had in the Septuagint, being interpreted Hellenistically because the words were Greek. It is an interesting and important point, and Mr. SNAITH proceeds to illustrate the point in the cases of Righteousness, Love, and the Holy Spirit.

It would be well worth while for a reader to follow the long and somewhat intricate argument about Righteousness in the Old and New Testaments. The general tenor is that, in respect of the words involved—*dikaion*, *dikaionne*, *dikaion*—the New Testament owes practically nothing to the Greek philosophers. Chrysostom made *dikaion* mean 'to make righteous.' This is generally agreed to be wrong, and in its place has come 'to declare righteous.' But this is equally wrong. Why should God declare a bad man to be what he is not? The error arises from the notion (completely erroneous) that man must offer God a righteousness, either imparted or imputed, before he can be saved. This has no basis in the Bible, certainly not in the meaning of *dikaion*, which is a 'salvation word,' a word that really means dealing with man in a way far beyond what justice requires. Faith, and not any kind of righteousness, is the one condition of salvation.

The same general conclusion follows a consideration of the word spirit. In the New Testament teaching as to the effective working of the Spirit of God we see most clearly the difference between the Hebrew and the Greek attitudes to life. The aim of the Hebrew system is to know God, of the Greek to know oneself. The two are fundamentally different. The Hebrew system starts with God. The Greek system starts with man and seeks to rise to an understanding of the nature and ways of God through the knowledge of 'man's higher nature.' According to the Bible, man has no higher nature except he be born of the Spirit. The whole Bible, Old and New Testament alike, is based on the Hebrew attitude and approach. In this matter there is a great difference between Christian theology and Biblical theology.

This is the soul of Pauline teaching, and the true development from the Pauline theology is to be found in Luther and John Wesley. This Reformation theology is certainly based on Biblical theology. It speaks of salvation by faith alone. It involves a complete trust in God, 'a recumbency on Him.' We are saved, not by any kind of righteousness, imparted or imputed, but by faith. We do not climb up to God by the aid of our own natural powers. It is God who by His Spirit lifts us out of our helplessness.

'Thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece' (Zec 9¹³) arose as a rallying cry long ago when some Jews sought to reinterpret Judaism in order to make it acceptable to Greek ways of thought and life. There have always been Jews who have sought to make terms with the Gentile world, and it has in time meant the death of Judaism for all such. There have been Christians from the beginning who have sought to do this. Our position, says Mr. SNAITH, is that this is wrong, that the reinterpretation of Biblical theology in terms of the ideas of Greek philosophers has been destructive of the essence of the Christian Faith. We hold, he says in his concluding words, that there can be no right answer to the question 'What is Christianity?' until we have come to a clear view of the distinctive ideas of both the Old and New Testaments and their difference from the pagan ideas which so largely have dominated 'Christian' thought.

A group of Lutheran ministers from North and Central Europe, who were in Great Britain in February 1946, have written a collection of Essays—*Luther Speaks*¹—for the fourth centenary of Martin Luther's death. There is a Foreword by Bishop BERGGRAV of Oslo, who deprecates recent attacks upon Luther, and in particular that made by Peter F. Wiener in his 'Martin Luther: Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor' (a book that the Bishop read with great annoyance during his captivity in the recent War).

It is the Bishop's contention that Luther was a real source of strength to the Norwegian Church in the time of the German occupation of the country. For example, a current question in 1941 was whether the clergy should hand over the Bishops' letters when the police came and demanded them. The history of the Reformation gave the answer. When in 1523 orders were sent out to many of the German States to confiscate pamphlets with translations from the Bible that Luther had written, this is what Luther said:

¹ Lutterworth Press; 8s. 6d. net.

'Not one page, not one letter shall you let them have—against the wreck of eternal blessedness. He who does it delivers Christ into Herod's hands. For they act as Herod the murderer of Christ did. We shall submit to their running through the house and using violence, but we shall not agree with or assist them, or follow them or obey them with one finger or step. For such tyrants do not behave as the authorities should.'

Or again, it was not clear during the spring of 1941 whether the pastors should continue to hold services and give short sermons on the wireless. But soon the Nazis wanted to exercise control over what was said. Could Luther give any guidance here? Oh, yes! he speaks in 1537 against the worldly masters who want to be bishops and even to govern the pulpit:

'From ruling by hand they have made themselves rulers of the mouth! The worldly masters want to rule the spiritual regime and govern the pulpit and Church, so that I shall be forced to preach what you, my Lordship, like to hear! No, rather the devil shall have my place and preach.'

The Bishop says it had a tremendous effect when they could send out this *parole* from Luther to the clergy who were in doubt about the radio question. In fact, despite the attacks on Luther during the War, he expresses the opinion that until now the world has not had two more diametrically opposed human contrasts than Adolf Hitler and Martin Luther, and he adds that in the Norwegian Lutheran-Evangelical Church they have tested this in experience.

The book before us falls into two sections. In the first section the writers aim at allowing Luther to speak for himself as pastor and teacher, as theologian and man of prayer. In the second section they speak themselves of the growth and development of Lutheran church-order and the life and work of the Lutheran churches. But they trust that Luther speaks through them, even after four hundred years.

One or two excerpts will give a further impression of the book. In the Essay on Luther as Preacher is quoted Luther's own conception of the language

which ought to be used in sermons: 'I would not have preachers in their sermons use Hebrew, Greek or foreign languages, for, in the Church, we ought to speak as we used to do at home, the plain mother tongue, which everyone is acquainted with. St. Paul never used such high and stately words as Demosthenes and Cicero did, but he spake, properly and plainly, words which signified and showed high and stately matters, and he did well.'

But even in New Testament times such an opinion on St. Paul would not have been unanimously endorsed. However, let that pass, and let us hear what Luther as Teacher says as to the necessity of knowing the Biblical languages, *i.e.*, Hebrew, Greek, and also Latin: 'Let this be said to us that we shall not retain the Gospel without the languages. The languages are the scabbard in which is the word of the Spirit; they are the tabernacle in which this piece of jewellery is being carried about; they are the cup in which this drink is contained; they are the larder in which this food lies; and as the Gospel itself says (Mt 14²⁰) they are the baskets in which these loaves and fishes and fragments are being kept.'

And yet Luther had already translated the Bible into German. But now, to end with, an excerpt from the chapter on Luther as Theologian. On the article concerning justification by faith alone, the chief doctrine of Reformation theology, he says, 'This is the article whereat the whole world doth take offence, and few there be that teach it aright, and still fewer that heartily believe it. There is ever in our hearts a reluctance to be nothing ourselves, and to let Christ do all. We always want to have a finger in the pie ourselves, and to serve God with such zeal as to compel Him to have respect unto us, and forgive us our sins, and grant us His grace. And that simply cannot be, nor ever shall be neither. For these twain are as oil and water in the heart; I cannot put my trust in both—one of them must go, either Christ or mine own works.'

The postscript is by the Editor for the group, Dr. Hans P. Ehrenberg, and consists of reflections 'at Luther's grave,' as in February 1946 he stood 'in thought' at Wittenberg.

The Unity of the New Testament.

The Doctrine of the Atonement.

BY PRINCIPAL VINCENT TAYLOR, D.D., WESLEY COLLEGE, HEADINGLEY, LEEDS.

THE doctrine of the Atonement is an especially instructive example of the unity of New Testament teaching. This unity does not mean that the same teaching is to be found in every part of the New Testament, but rather that the distinctive ideas which are characteristic of individual writers rest upon a common basis, bringing out points which are wanting or latent elsewhere and so establishing an organic whole. In recording New Testament teaching it is common to describe what the Synoptic Gospels attest, what is taught in the Acts, in the Pauline and Johannine writings, in the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, and in the Apocalypse. This method has the advantage of convenience, and no harm is done provided we do not forget that we are dealing with cross sections of living tissue, in short, with the witness of a growing Church. This consideration ought to make us more alert than we are in appraising the varieties of New Testament teaching, as if one type could be welcomed and chosen to the neglect or rejection of another. Variations of emphasis and degrees of fullness undoubtedly exist, but we estimate them aright only if we recognize that behind these differences there is a common life and experience.

Some years ago (1928) a book was published under the title, *The Evening of the Last Supper*, written by Dr. H. M. Foston. Many readers and some reviewers found the book obscure, but in part at least the reason was that attention was not given to the writer's plea for what may be called a biological, as distinct from an atomistic, approach to the Gospels. 'There has entered into the production of the Gospels,' Dr. Foston wrote, 'as a total group, a type of causation which is more profoundly allied to that type of causation which is traced in the world of organizing life, than to those more divided sorts of literary and traditional causes on which current theorizing about the origins of the Gospels so absorbingly relies.' It is to be feared that this seed fell by the wayside. *Mutatis mutandis* the principle is relevant to the New Testament writings as a whole. In every Gospel and Epistle there are elements which point beyond what is written and call for further development and elucidation. This is the task attempted by the Fourth Evangelist in relation to the Synoptic tradition, and it may be said that it is the task of theology, however imperfectly it may be carried

out, to pursue this enlarging and integrating purpose. Only by such methods can the unity of New Testament teaching be appreciated.

I. *Primitive Christian Belief.* The theology of the first Christian communities was rooted in the ideas of the Old Testament. In this fact lies the vital importance of the Old Testament for Christian belief. It contains formative ideas which remain incomplete until their significance is seen in the light of the Cross and the Resurrection. Among these elements are Old Testament teaching concerning God, sin, forgiveness, atonement, and sacrifice, the rites and practices of the cultus, the message of the prophets concerning righteousness, the teaching of the Second Isaiah regarding the Suffering Servant, Jeremiah's message about the New Covenant, and the use made by Ezekiel and Daniel of the term 'Son of Man.' These ideas were used by Jesus and fused into a whole when He spoke of His suffering, death, and exaltation, and in turn they were drawn upon by the first Christian preachers and teachers when they sought to interpret the events which had happened in their midst (cf. Ac 10³⁶⁻⁴³).

In some of our text-books we are struck by the bareness of the account they give of the teaching of the Synoptic Gospels relative to the Atonement. In part this circumstance is due to the modern reaction against the work of older scholars who treated uncritically types and symbols in the details of the worship of the Tabernacle and the Temple. In part it is due to an over-emphasis of the originality of St. Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and St. John; to excessive scientific caution and a want of historical imagination. Happily in present-day theology there are welcome signs of a more constructive use of the Old Testament, a more discerning study of the theology of the Gospels, and a more intelligent recognition of the debt which even the greatest of the New Testament writers owed to primitive Christian belief and worship. From the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles we can learn much of the beliefs of the first Christians regarding Christ's death. I believe that we can also speak constructively concerning the thoughts of Jesus Himself as in the course of His mission He faced the prospect of suffering and death. It does not seem credible that He approached death without

the shadow of an idea why He must die, or that He explained to Himself His suffering simply as illustrating the general principle of self-sacrifice.

As the Head of the Messianic community (the Son of Man) Jesus believed that His death was necessary in fulfilment of the redemptive purpose of God. In dying vicariously He would establish, through the surrender of His life, a new covenant-relationship between God and men, into which men might enter through self-committal or faith, sustained by sacramental communion and expressed in sacrificial living (cf. Lk 22²⁹, Mk 14²²⁻²⁴ 8³⁴). His Messianic task, as He interpreted it, was one of suffering and rejection (cf. Mk 8³¹ 9³¹ 10^{38f.}, Lk 17²⁵, etc.). This suffering, however, was vocational as well as personal. As the Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man, He stood in a representative relation to men, so that He could speak of His out-poured life as availing for many, or, in the language of symbol, as providing 'a ransom for many' (Mk 10⁴⁵). The closer definition of this sacrificial ministry for men is not brought out in any of His sayings. He spoke indeed of a 'cup' which it was necessary for Him to drink (Mk 10^{38f.}), and which theologians have attempted to interpret in various ways as an experience of sin-bearing, but His prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane shows that the full meaning of 'the cup' was hidden from Him and that He was content to accept it as of the Father's appointing. These sayings and the story of Calvary itself set the problems for subsequent Christian thinking and interpretation.

If we study the Gospels, the Acts, 1 Peter, the Apocalypse, and the Pastoral Epistles we can form a reasonably clear conception of what primitive Christianity believed and taught about the work of Christ. We can see that the first Christians believed that His death was the embodiment of a Divine purpose, that it had a Messianic character, that it was closely connected with sin and had a vicarious and redemptive significance, that it was interpreted in terms of sacrifice and of the Servant-teaching of Is 53; above all, that it was regarded as crowned in the glory of the Resurrection and was related to ethical and spiritual ends. Of other ideas, which remained to be treated by the greatest of the New Testament writers, we can see fainter traces, such as the conception of a faith-relationship between the believer and Christ, the development of eucharistic teaching, the thought of suffering with Christ, and the relation between His death and the love of God. We trace also a growing emphasis upon the universality of His redemptive ministry. It is tempting to trace back the influence of many of these ideas upon the sayings of Jesus, and in principle it is not to be denied that Old Testament conceptions may have coloured the primitive record. In the end, how-

ever, any wholesale application of this method proves to be its own refutation. It is much more credible, and indeed much more scientific, to assume that the creative influence of the teaching and actions of Jesus lies behind the ferment of primitive Christian thinking than to suppose that the latter came into being *ex nihilo*. One other observation needs to be made. The great New Testament writers, who treated more fully aspects of the doctrine of the Atonement, shared to the full and were greatly influenced by primitive Christian belief. To the writings already mentioned we need to add many passages from the Pauline Epistles and the Johannine writings, the Fourth Gospel and the three Epistles, as well as from the Epistle to the Hebrews; in particular, 1 Th 5^{9f.}, Gal 1⁴, 1 Co 6²⁰ 7²³ 11²³⁻²⁵ 15³, 2 Co 5¹⁴, Ro 4²⁵ 5⁸, He 9¹² 10¹⁹ 12²⁴ 13¹². 20, 1 Jn 1⁷ 3¹⁶ 4¹⁴. These passages are not distinctively Pauline or Alexandrian or Johannine but illustrate in various ways the common stock of ideas and beliefs characteristic of the primitive period. They show how great is the unity of New Testament teaching in spite of diversity of treatment and interest.

II. *The Distinctive Teaching of St. Paul, the Author of Hebrews, and St. John.* The debt of these writers to primitive Christianity has been sufficiently emphasized, and it remains to consider the special contribution of each within the unity of New Testament teaching. None of them has a doctrine of the Atonement, but each gives prominence to important aspects of the doctrine which have left a deep impress on subsequent Christian thought.

St. Paul, in particular, never set himself to frame and state a doctrine. There is no Pauline theory of the Atonement. The time for such an undertaking had not yet come. Moreover, Paul himself is far from being a systematic theologian, and, in any case, he was much too busily engaged in the work of evangelization, in controversy, and in caring for the churches he had founded. Nevertheless, he emphasizes ideas vital to a full appreciation of the wonder and meaning of the Cross. Chief among these is the prominence he gives to the idea of God in Christ. In his teaching it is God who forgives, reconciles, saves, and sanctifies; and these things He does in Christ. Nothing is more characteristic of his teaching than his declaration that 'in Christ, God was reconciling the world unto Himself' (2 Co 5¹⁹). It was God, he declares, who plainly set forth Christ 'as a means of atonement,' in virtue of His out-poured life, to be appropriated by faith, and this He did in order to show forth His righteousness or salvation, that He Himself might be righteous and give a standing ground before Him (Justification) to the

man whose approach is based upon faith in Jesus (Ro 3^{25f.}).¹ 'God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' The more one appreciates the greatness of this teaching, the more clearly one sees how un-Pauline are theories of the Atonement which imply that a Divine hostility toward men was overcome by the gracious intervention of Christ. Paul is faithful to the conviction of Jesus that His suffering and death fulfilled the redemptive purpose of God.

Ro 1²⁹⁻³¹, 2 Co 12²⁰, Gal 5¹⁹⁻²¹, and Col 3⁵⁻⁹ reveal how seriously Paul faced the problem of sin. He does not limit himself to one view of its origin and nature, for he speaks of its beginnings in the sin of Adam, of the evil impulse or inclination by which man is tempted to his undoing, and of hostile powers which threaten his blessedness. He is more deeply concerned to speak of that work of God in Christ by which sin is overthrown and destroyed. Verging upon, without actually crossing, the bounds of substitutionary teaching, he thinks of Christ as our Representative, the Second Adam, or federal Head of a redeemed humanity. In the language of paradox he describes Him as 'made to be sin on our behalf' (2 Co 5²¹) and as having become 'a curse for us' (Gal 3¹³), statements which mark his nearest approach to the idea of 'sin-bearing.' This teaching is preserved from the error of presenting Christ's death as a transaction, and so from externalism, by two elements which are of cardinal importance in his theology: his insistence upon the work of the Spirit within us and his constant emphasis upon the faith-relationship between the believer and Christ. It is 'through the Spirit by faith' that we wait for 'the hope of righteousness,' and nothing else avails save 'faith wrought by love' (Gal 5^{6f.}).

In no sense is it disloyalty to the greatness of Paul to say that, beyond describing the work of Christ as one of obedience (Ro 5¹⁹) and as the vicarious acceptance of the judgment of God upon sin, he does not define more fully the mediatorial ministry of Christ for men. Only once does he speak of it as intercession (Ro 8³⁴). It is significant, however, of the unity of New Testament teaching that it is just this gap in Pauline theology which is filled, though by no means completely, by the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Rooted in primitive Christian teaching, the Epistle to the Hebrews concentrates attention upon the Person of Christ and His representative ministry under the category of sacrifice. Passage after passage speaks of Him as our High Priest on high (2¹⁷ 3^{1f.} 4¹⁴⁻¹⁶ 5^{5f.} 9^{f.} 6²⁰ 7²⁶ 8^{1f.} 9¹¹ 10²¹) and of the offering of Himself to God on our behalf

(1³ 2¹⁷ 7²⁷ 9^{11f.} 14. 26. 28 10¹⁰. 12. 14. 19-23 12²⁴ 13^{11f.} 20^{f.}). Characteristic among these passages are 10¹²: 'But he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God,' 10¹⁴: 'For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,' and, perhaps above all, 9²⁴: 'Christ entered . . . into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us.' This conception of the mediatorial ministry of Christ on high is most impressive, but it cannot be claimed that the author makes clear the nature of the One Sacrifice.² Reasons for this are the small extent to which he dwells upon the love of God, his silence about Christ's self-identification with sinners, and the absence of teaching concerning faith-union with Christ, sacramental communion, and mystical suffering with Him. To mention these things is not to detract from his greatness. Once more we are reminded of the unity of the New Testament, for these are the very themes which meet us in the Pauline letters and the Johannine writings.

Of the distinctiveness of the Johannine teaching there can be no question. John's main emphasis lies upon the Cross as the revelation and manifestation of the Love of God. 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life' (Jn 3¹⁶). 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the expiation for our sins' (1 Jn 4¹⁰).³ That which gives meaning and value to this transcendent expression of love is the Johannine doctrine of the Incarnation. Christ is the Word of God and the Only-begotten Son; and it is as such that He becomes flesh, lays down His life for men, and is glorified and exalted. It is on this basis and in this framework of belief that the Atonement is presented. Again the category is sacrificial. Christ is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (Jn 1²⁹). He sanctifies Himself that His disciples also may be sanctified in truth (Jn 17¹⁹). He is like the grain of wheat which, if it die, beareth much fruit (Jn 12²⁴). He is our Advocate with the Father; He Himself is the Expiation, not for our sins only, but also for the whole world (1 Jn 2^{1f.}). So far from being remote from us in His death and exaltation, He gives His flesh for the life of the world (Jn 6⁵¹) and through believing in Him (ἐἰς αὐτόν) men receive the gift of life in its richest and most abiding form (Jn 3¹⁴⁻¹⁶).

This Johannine teaching is of imperishable value

² I have discussed this question in *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*² [1945], 126-30.

³ I think the Gospel and the Epistles were written by the same author, but in any case all illustrate the theology of the Johannine School.

¹ Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 1., 295-300.

to the Church and to the individual believer. It has fewer notes than Pauline teaching, but they have a deep diapason quality with which instinctively many readers of the New Testament find themselves to be in harmony. The more questing and critical mind finds itself raising problems to which Johannine theology gives no answer, and turns with deeper satisfaction to the depths of Pauline teaching and the lone heights of Alexandrian thought. In *Readings in St. John's Gospel* the late Archbishop Temple told us that Bishop Gore once said to him that he paid visits to St. John as to a fascinating foreign country, but that he came home to St. Paul. 'With me,' wrote Dr. Temple, 'the precise opposite is true. St. Paul is the exciting, and also rather bewildering, adventure; with St. John I am at home' (p.v.). Among modern Christians this division runs deep, and no harm is done if we do not allow our preferences to destroy the unity of New Testament teaching. In a letter to the present writer Dr. Temple explained that in the words quoted above he was not thinking of *making* the Fourth Gospel our home but of *finding* it there, and that so far as one *makes* anything one's home, it must be the whole New Testament. No more impressive testimony to the true unity of the New Testament could be given.

III. *New Testament Teaching and the Doctrine of the Atonement.* It is no part of the present

essay to attempt to state the doctrine of the Atonement, but only to indicate its relation to the wholeness of New Testament teaching. It is significant that almost all the great theories have been based on that teaching, and that, in so far as they have failed, their failure has been due to an excessive dependence upon certain elements in it and the consequent neglect of others. This is true of the so-called classic theory which emphasizes the victory of Christ over sin, Satan, and death, of the theory associated with the name of Abailard, and the forensic interpretations of later Reformation teachers. Abailard and his many successors down to modern times have rested too exclusively on those great passages which affirm that the Cross is the revelation of Divine love, and Anselm neglected them only to lose in his great intellectual formulation the deepest and most Christian elements. Too often what Christ has done has been separated from its spiritual appropriation in the heart of the believer, and sacrifice has been conceived on pagan rather than Biblical analogies. The plea that we must build on the teaching of the whole Bible does not mean that theological construction is no more than the assembling of Biblical data. Especially in the appreciation of Christ's supreme work for men things must be said for which there is no warrant in proof texts, but unless the theological house is built on deep Scriptural foundations it is sure to fall. Soteriology is Biblical or nothing, however high into the heavens it soars.

Literature.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE TO THE HINDU.

It is hardly necessary to tell any one in Scotland—at least any one in Scotland who is concerned with the coming of the Kingdom of God—who A. G. Hogg is. Far beyond the bounds of Scotland his name and his work as an educational missionary and as Principal of the Madras Christian College—*præclarum nomen*—are known and honoured. We open Dr. Hogg's latest book, *The Christian Message to the Hindu* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), expecting much and we are not disappointed.

The 'three dozen years during which,' Dr. Hogg tells us, he has had 'the privilege of seeking to declare and interpret Christ to Indian youth' have given him an exceptional opportunity of understanding the mind and heart of Hinduism, and of this opportunity he has made full use. It is true, no doubt, that it is the Hinduism of the

intellectuals that he has come closest to, those who have grown up in the atmosphere of the Vedanta, of which the appeal is addressed rather to the head than to the heart. Nevertheless, Hindu students of this type have hungry hearts as well as acute and active minds, and to them Dr. Hogg proclaims a message which is no procession of 'bloodless categories.' He does not fall into the error of presenting to them a Christian philosophy adjusted to their supposed demands or needs. That kind of 'sympathetic approach' does not appeal to him. He seeks rather 'to be alertly conscious of the points where the Gospel challenges Hindu religious conceptions most radically or fundamentally.' His is a kind of 'bridge-building' that Karl Barth himself would not surely be prepared to denounce. Dr. Hogg would begin where the Gospel challenges his students, but he would not end there. He would go on to recognize that there are bridges that the Christian messenger can

use that give entry to the heart of the Hindu, bridges built not by any earthly builder but by the Pontifex Maximus Himself.

That this is a live book dealing not with abstractions but with the tides that ebb and flow within the human heart is indicated by its chapter headings. Thus three of these are 'Come, follow Me,' 'Come, join My Church,' 'Come, face with Me the Karma of Humanity.' It is personal relationships between living men and God with which Dr. Hogg deals, seeking to bring about 'the divine encounter.'

The chapter which deals with Karma is important since that conception has a central place in Hindu belief and cannot be by-passed. The doctrine of Karma is valued by many thoughtful Hindus as providing what they think to be an explanation of suffering. Dr. Hogg shows how the Christian way of dealing with this problem is 'far more deeply moral than the Hindu way.' 'The Hindu declaration is,' he says, "'There is no problem for there is no undeserved suffering.'" The truly Christian declaration is, "'There is no problem for it is right that there should be undeserved suffering.'" He suggests that the Christian creed for India should, therefore, 'include an article declaring it to be morally necessary that the just should suffer with and for the unjust.' Thus India, just because of the individualism of its Karma doctrine, itself points to the Christian conclusion that 'the individual brother's sin must be wiped out in the human brotherhood's suffering.'

There is indeed much in this book which one could linger over as indicating how, as Dr. Hogg himself claims, his apprehension of the gospel 'has been enriched and clarified by having to think it out afresh for himself under the stimulus of intercourse with the Hindu mind.'

One instance of this deserves special mention. In the chapter headed 'Come, join My Church' he draws attention to the place of community in Hindu life. The Karma doctrine is, indeed, narrowly individualist, but there is at the same time in Hinduism a vital sense of kinship that makes it very hard for a Hindu to break the bonds of brotherhood that unite those who are within the Hindu pale. He tells us of one of his students who had become wholly Christian in his personal faith but found it impossible to forsake his community-loyalty and was convinced that Christ Himself would not require this of him. Dr. Hogg began to reflect on all that was here implied and, he says, was humbled by the reflection 'that his own message had for long been "distorted by an inherited individualism."' I began to realize how persistently in regard to the whole issue of redemption from evil the Bible tends to think socially or corporately rather than individually. For it individual salvation is a sharing of a corporate human redemption, and, indeed, of a cosmical redemption.'

Enough has perhaps been said to indicate how suggestive and how full of the wisdom of experience this book is. Every one whose business it is to reach the heart of the thoughtful Hindu—who is

after all just one type of the thoughtful man in any land—should study it.

NICOL MACNICOL.

OUR HUMAN PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTION.

Here are two books dealing, each in its own way, with subjects that touch one another, so that at times the authors cross each other's path.

Professor Edmund F. Sutcliffe, S.J., has given us a detailed and interesting study of *The Old Testament and the Future Life* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 16s. net). He is a close student of the Scriptures, and finds on them at every step. Starting from the familiar fact that the long sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt—where a characteristic of the people was their preoccupation with the future life—completely failed to turn their thoughts in that direction, but left them still true Semites, like the Babylonians engrossed in this present world, and assuming that the moral laws work themselves out on this side of the grave, and so little interested in what lies beyond, our author shows us in two chapters, one upon the teaching on these matters in the Pentateuch, and one—a study of so fine and late a book as Ecclesiasticus—how strangely long the Hebrew mind remained contented with that creed, how curiously slow it proved to make any advance on it at all.

True, he is of the firm opinion that the accepted view of Sheol is too grim and gloomy and negative. Thus the denial of activity to its inhabitants means merely of such activities as those with which we are familiar. But there may be others open to them yonder. And passages that seem to assert that they are cut off from God are to be interpreted as implying only that the type of service and of worship we can render to Him here are closed to them. Still, he is puzzled by the long halt before the Hebrew mind moved forward. Certain passages in the Psalms, which seem to look out confidently into the future life, are explained away as being much simpler and more mundane. Thus, when the Psalmist (Ps 17) says, 'For me, let me in righteousness see Thy face; Let me be sated, on awaking, with Thy likeness,' he is merely asking that in his morning prayer he may have real communion with God. And so on. Still, there were minds staggered and perplexed by the orthodox creed, which did not seem to face and meet the facts. As Mr. Blunden has it,

I have been young, and now am not too old,
And I have seen the righteous forsaken,
His health, his honour, and his quality taken.
This is not what we were formerly told.

And others were concussed by their own experience into feeling what Butler felt, that this life looks as if it were only a first volume that needs a second to round off the story; which volume, he thought, is there. And so did they, with a growing certainty as the years slipped away. But it is only when we reach books as late as Wisdom and Daniel that the doctrine of rewards and punish-

ments hereafter comes fully into view. A short chapter upon Purgatory, for which he calls as witnesses only two passages—the famous one in 2 Mac, and another in the Fourth Book of Ezra; a long and careful one upon the Resurrection of the Body, and another on the Doctrine of the Extra-Canonical Books brings to an end a work, interesting partly because of the angle from which it is written, and not a little because of the fairness of the author's mind.

The second volume, entitled *Stubborn Soil*, by Mr. Seton Pollock (Sidgwick & Jackson; 12s. 6d. net), is a study of the Wisdom Literature. Mr. Pollock is a layman, with the advantages that accrue to him from that. And if any are inclined to question his credentials, we have a Preface from Professor Elmslie which says confidently, he has 'acquired to the full the technical knowledge required for his high purpose, and readers may be assured that what he has to say regarding these books presents thoroughly established conclusions of scholars.' And of his translations of the texts of Proverbs and Job and Ecclesiastes, 'Would that all translators could have reached his level of essential fidelity to the original combined with fine literary sensitiveness.' The book consists of two parts, a version of passages of the texts which undoubtedly brings them close to our mood, and mind, and understanding, and a series of vivid pointed essays on the practical problems of the works discussed. Certainly these make clear how modern, as we say, how real and pressing for us now, are the enigmas by which these old writers found themselves confronted; how they still face us, clamouring for a solution, which is not there, except in Jesus Christ. A. J. Gossip.

THE SPEAKER'S LECTURESHIP.

From 1942 to 1945 the late Principal Emeritus of Regent's Park College, Oxford, Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, was Speaker's Lecturer at the University of Oxford. During his tenure of the Lectureship he delivered a course that forms the major part of the posthumous volume from his pen now published under the title, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (Cumberlege; 15s. net).

Since 1911, the year in which his 'Christian Doctrine of Man' appeared, the name of H. Wheeler Robinson has been before students of Christian theology as that of a scholarly, competent, thoughtful, and attractive expositor of the traditional material, especially as it is presented in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The volume now before us (which it is a pleasure to handle, so beautifully is it printed and so tastefully bound) will enhance that reputation.

The general subject of the lectures is approached through three 'subordinate' topics, namely, God and Nature, God and Man, God and History. The treatment of those topics, 'subordinate' as they are, occupies more than half the book. But it is only fair to add that Dr. Robinson did not live to complete the whole scheme that was in his mind. He had intended to include a chapter or chapters on the growth of the Canon of the Old

Testament, and the nature of the authority attached to it by early Judaism and primitive Christianity.

It should also be observed that the first part of the main subject (Inspiration and Revelation) finds a place in the course of the treatment of the three topics above named. Nature is said to reveal God as being the unique utterance of a unique Being, as having been made to be the arena of history, and as carrying the mind up to the God on whom Nature wholly depends. Man also reveals God, offering by his self-consciousness and in his social relations new channels of revelation to which Nature cannot attain. History also reveals God; in gathering the story of many generations, it can show the depth of meaning in the Divine will and its dynamic force.

In the second part of the main subject the nature of the prophetic inspiration is the central theme, and the discussion culminates in the question of the theological validity of prophecy: is it from heaven or from men? We could wish that Dr. Robinson had straightened out his answer a little more, especially in its concluding portion. But he does well to defend the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic language of the prophets, though we may be more conscious than they of its ultimate inadequacy. He also does well to maintain as essential to the doctrine of revelation the prophetic truth of the Divine initiative, though we may not be satisfied with the psychology through which it found expression. As for the intuitional character of prophecy, it may well be one aspect of its validity, as marking that subjective factor which appears to be characteristic of all religion. But along with the subjective factor go the objective features. As Dr. William Temple has emphasized it in his Gifford Lectures, the revelation is a product of event and interpretation, an interlinking of history and meaning. Thus the authority of the religious fact so constituted is both subjective and objective, and, as Dr. Robinson adds, 'in that duality lies its continued vitality.' And he concludes: 'There are secondary and delegated authorities in religion, with which we cannot dispense, and such are the Church and the Bible. But, in the last resort, it is in the prophetic consciousness and its continuance in personal religion that there is found the ultimate sanctuary in which the voice of God is still heard, the sanctuary in which the ancient Scriptures are still transformed into His living oracles.'

In the third and fourth parts of the main subjects Dr. Robinson considers the revelations through the priest and the 'wise man,' through Tōrah and Wisdom, respectively. Many will find these chapters even more informative, from the exegetical standpoint, than the preceding ones. The concluding chapter treats of the response of the Psalmists, who praise the God whom the prophets find, who sing in psalmody to the God who has spoken to man in prophecy.

Experts in Hebrew and Semitic studies might have much to say about the wealth of exegetical matter this book contains, but we are content to add that to read and assimilate its contents would

be for many a liberal education in the Old Testament.
W. FULTON.

CANADIAN METHODISM.

British Methodists have been singularly ill-informed of the history of their sister Church in Canada, and the Union in 1925 of Canadian Methodism with the Congregational and Presbyterian Churches has tended to obliterate even the memory of the existence of a Methodist Church in the Dominion. All the more welcome, therefore, is the appearance of *Methodism in the Middle West*, by the Rev. J. H. Riddell, D.D., LL.D. (Ryerson Press, Toronto; 15s. 6d. net).

This bulky volume is a faithful and painstaking record of the origins and growth of the Methodist Church in the Prairie Provinces. Upon its pages are found such place-names as Moose Jaw, Hudson Bay, Red River, and Saskatchewan, and if these names conjure up visions of trappers, redskins, scalps, and wigwams, the reader will not be disappointed, for in a missionary setting they are here in abundance.

In 1840 the Hudson Bay Company invited the Wesleyan Methodist Church in England to establish missions in their territories. Four missionaries began their work among the illiterate Indians in Rupertsland, and the story which Dr. Riddell unfolds is one of heroism and adventure, privation and famine, expansion and consolidation, a story which is equal to the best in the annals of missionary enterprise.

We fear that this book will make no general appeal in this country. It is, as the publishers suggest, 'an encyclopædia of persons, places, events, and dates,' and for that reason is unlikely to attract the ordinary reader on this side of the Atlantic. But Dr. Riddell has done his Church a great service in compiling this record of a great achievement which can too easily be forgotten now that Canadian Methodism has merged its identity in the United Church, and the historian will welcome this addition to his shelves.

Copies of the book may be obtained from the London agents, Messrs. Hatchards, 187 Piccadilly, W.1.

WESLEY F. SWIFT.

A MODEST MASTERPIECE.

Is the form of these cheery, breezy, unconventionally frank and really profound discussions of religion with sixth form boys—*Approach to Christianity*, by Mr. A. R. Bielby (S.C.M.; 2s. net)—repellently artificial, or is it attractive and disarming? It is high praise to say that the form justifies itself and, as in Plato's Dialogues, the interlocutors are real persons who make their contribution.

As to the content the reader will do well to make himself deaf to the patronizing note in the Bishop's introduction and recognize at once in this lay mathematician a masterly theologian in deep rapport with the modern mind and fully possessed of the most up-to-date apologetic equipment. He avoids giving the impression, so often left by Mr.

Lewis and other such writers, that he is conjuring the old orthodox rabbit out of a very modern hat, and rather suggests that the way is open to progress and originality in the formulation and acceptance of a genuinely Christian faith. Boys, teachers, and ministers will find here wise, courageous, and suggestive thought.

R. W. STEWART.

The biography of a notable schoolmaster, *Flecker of Dean Close* (Canterbury Press; 6s. net), by Charles Williams, preserves a tribute to one who in his scholastic career impressed himself as a great teacher and a profoundly religious personality. There is a moving introduction by Bishop Stephen Neill and a foreword by Viscount Caldecote, P.C., with an affectionate testimony by Lady Clarke, wife of Sir Edward Clarke, one of Flecker's most intimate friends. It is an indication of the vitality of Flecker that, when he retired from the Headmastership of Dean Close, he began a new career in the ministry of the Church of England when he was over sixty years of age.

God and the Jews (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Reginald Glanville, is written with placid and intelligent familiarity with the Scriptures to stress the fact that in their testimony and their sufferings the Jews stand beside Christians as witnesses to God in a heathen world and to urge the Bible doctrine that the full salvation of the world waits on the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile in Christ.

It was well worth while to print the Rev. Norman H. Snaith's Broadcast Talks on Ideas of God—*What's Your Idea?* (Epworth Press; 1s. net). It may be a question whether the informal slanginess, which was a deliberate and probably successful attempt to catch and hold the B.B.C. listener, is useful for a reader, yet it has force and makes one wonder if much religious appeal may not be too solemn in form. No one should be deterred by the style from learning much both from the form and the content of these addresses to the vaguely religious mind. It is rightly emphasized that the Hebrew conception of the living, acting God is more in accord with modern thought than are the abstract and static notions of Divinity in Greek philosophy. It is indeed along this line that any modernizing of the Creeds must be sought.

Golden Pavements, by Bertram Lister, M.A. (Lindsey Press; 2s. 6d. net), is the title of some talks to children, on such themes as Florence Nightingale, Dick Whittington, Magna Carta, the Tower of London, and perhaps likeliest to interest Metropolitan audiences.

A new commentary on *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians* (Lutterworth Press; 5s. net) testifies to the unceasing interest in the Bible and

its message. And this guide, by the Rev. Canon H. G. G. Herklots, M.A., Director of Religious Education for the Diocese of Sheffield, will offer all needed assistance to the reader who wishes to understand the Letter. The introduction is brief but sufficient. Canon Herklots examines the case for the Ephesian origin of the Captivity Epistles and states the arguments fairly, but concludes definitely for the traditional theory of the period of the imprisonment at Rome. The commentary is divided into sections, each with a heading, giving its substance, and the English text is explained word by word, clearly and succinctly. The commentary is not a school book, but is meant for the general reader, and is one of a new series which, with this book, makes a promising start.

An interesting and valuable discussion of what is the real problem of our time will be found in *Freedom and Control, A Christian Interpretation*, by the Rev. E. V. Newman, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Principal of Tupon College, Tonga (S.C.M.; 6s. net). We are witnessing to-day the usual tendency of people to get into separate and opposing camps through emphasizing exclusively what is only half a truth. But Robertson of Brighton taught many of us long ago that the truth was never found in an extreme, or between two extremes, but always by putting the two opposing halves together. This is what Mr. Newman has done in his book. He fully appreciates the truth in freedom and also the truth in control. But he contends

persuasively that these are just half truths and that the whole truth is found only by putting them together. And the whole truth is a spiritual unity. It is only in Christianity that the imperfect members find their fulfilment. 'This book,' he says, 'is written in the faith that we live in a universe whose central and controlling reality is spiritual.' This contention is supported by an argument which is marked by unconventional freshness and knowledge of men and things. It is a sound book on a great theme.

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin has written an interesting, and at every point helpful, book on worship—*The Public Worship of God* (Westminster Press, Philadelphia; \$2.00). It is written in the tradition of the Reformed Churches, but (as one would expect) the author is broad enough in his sympathies to see and use the spiritual treasures of the Pre-Reformation centuries. He begins by laying a theological foundation and goes on to discuss the art of public worship (ritual and ceremonial), the composition of public prayers, the offering of praise, and the sacraments. The book is informed throughout by scholarship, and by plain common sense and good taste. It is also full of helpful counsel for those whose duty it is to lead the devotions of the worshippers, and in this are included the leaders of praise. It is hardly necessary to say that this book should be widely read and digested by the clergy, particularly of all non-liturgical churches.

Nehemiah—Ezra?

BY THE REVEREND W. M. F. SCOTT, M.A., LIVERPOOL.

WHICH came first, Ezra or Nehemiah? Nearly all scholars now accept the conjecture that the Artaxerxes of the Ezra stories is not Artaxerxes I as in the Nehemiah stories, but Artaxerxes II. Therefore the date of Ezra's visit to Jerusalem 'in the seventh year of Artaxerxes' (Ezr 7¹) is now held to be 397 instead of 457, while Nehemiah's arrival at Jerusalem 'in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes' (Neh 2¹) is still dated at 444.

According to the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah Ezra set out from Babylon in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, arrived at Jerusalem and dealt with the mixed marriages at once. Nothing more is heard of him until thirteen years later when in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Ezra introduced his law in the midst of the doings of Nehemiah. Any modern text book on the period will show what problems and confusions are raised by this account. What can have been the relation between two leaders both working at the same time, but never together except according to three passages which are textually doubtful? The

result is to predispose people to throw over the Chronicler's whole account. But it is worth remembering that we have in 1 Es an independent Greek version of the Chronicler's work, which has been shown to be nearer at this point to the Chronicler's original.¹ It dates all Ezra's activities to 457-6, which gives us a perfectly straightforward chronology. Realizing then that the Chronicler believed that Ezra left Babylon in 457 and completed his reforms in about fourteen months, and that Nehemiah followed about twelve years later, we must first examine the objections to this account and then weigh up some of the points in its favour.

The Objections.

(1) Nehemiah recorded in his memoirs (7⁴) that 'the city was wide and large: but the people were few therein, and the houses were not builded'—a state of affairs which he set himself to remedy.

¹ L. E. Browne, *Early Judaism*, ch. 2; Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 256 f.

But Ezra found 'a very great congregation of men and women and children' (10¹) gathered to hear what he was going to do about the mixed marriages. Therefore it is said that Ezra must have lived after Nehemiah's measures increased the population to a size which would make such a congregation possible.

This argument will hardly bear examination. The question of population is purely relative. A population large enough to provide a great congregation may not have been enough to defend Jerusalem and to rebuild its walls. To take a modern parallel, when visiting Plymouth in 1942 I was told that it was a city of the dead and that the streets were deserted. I could see with my own eyes that the place was in ruins—'the city was wide and large; but the people were few therein, and the houses were not builded.' But outside St. Catherine's Church at 6.15 p.m. on Easter Day I found a notice, 'All seats taken.' There was evidently 'a very great congregation of men and women and children.' Moreover it is not legitimate to stress the details of Ezr 10¹ which comes not from Ezra's memoirs but from the Chronicler's pen. His wish to exalt his hero Ezra would naturally find expression in such touches as this. He felt that Ezra's chief actions were so important that there must be a crowd worthy of the occasion. Moreover Ezr 4⁷⁻²⁴ records an attack on Jerusalem 'in the days of Artaxerxes' (4⁷). It was due to an attempt to rebuild the walls and is widely regarded as the event which prompted Nehemiah to go to Jerusalem in 444. If we put Ezra in 457, then this attack would come between Ezra and Nehemiah and would account for the desolation found by the latter, which had no doubt been increased by voluntary evacuation. It should be noted also that the congregation attracted by Ezra is not confined to the inhabitants of Jerusalem but comes 'out of Israel' (10¹). The interest in mixed marriages would have been greater amongst those who live in close contact with non-Jews outside the city wall.

(2) It is said that Ezra finds the city walls built. For he gives thanks (9⁹) that 'God . . . hath extended mercy unto us . . . to give us a wall in Judah and in Jerusalem.' Since Nehemiah's great achievement was the building of the wall, Ezra could not have given thanks for the wall until Nehemiah had done his work.

But the word here translated walls, *geder*, does not occur again in the whole of Ezra-Nehemiah though the wall was one of its biggest topics. Only once out of all its uses in the Old Testament does the word refer to a city wall (Mic 7¹¹). Only on one other occasion does the R.V. translate it by wall in a reference to the Temple partition in

Ezk 42^{7,10,12}. In fact, the word means fence and generally a fence of a vineyard. The LXX recognizes this by using *τείχος* to translate all other references to the wall in Ezra-Nehemiah, and using *φραγμός*, a fence, to render *geder* here. Furthermore we find that in several of the instances where *geder* is used of a vineyard fence, the vineyard is simply a figure of Israel and the fence of Jehovah's protection. For example, in Ps 80 Israel is compared to a vine and the Psalmist asks 'why hast thou broken down her fences, so that all they which pass by the way do pluck her?' This figure gives a perfectly adequate explanation of the meaning in Ezr 9⁹. Oesterley says¹ that the word 'never has a figurative sense when referring to a wall' and so is not figurative here. But since the word only refers to a wall once (or at the most twice if we include the partition fence of Ezk 42) his reasoning need not be taken very seriously. The figurative interpretation is confirmed by 1 Es 8⁸¹, which has 'to give us a sure abiding (Gr. *στερέωμα*) in Jewry and Jerusalem,' and also by the phrase 'a wall in Judah and Jerusalem.' Judah comes first, and the wall in that case must be figurative. It is no way out of the difficulty to say that Jerusalem is epexegetic. Batten solves the problem by striking out the phrase 'in Judah' but it is no argument to assume your conclusions and then to doctor the text to make it provide the required evidence.

Those who still insist on taking the wall literally should note that it only took Nehemiah fifty-two days to finish the wall (Neh 6¹⁶) which suggests that it was a matter of repairing and completing an existing wall, not making an entirely new one.

(3) At the time when Nehemiah built the walls Eliashib was high priest (Neh 3^{1, 20, 21}). But in Ezr 10⁸ we read that Ezra 'went into the chamber of Jehohanan the son of Eliashib.' It is said that here 'son of' equals 'grandson of,' since we find in Neh 12¹¹ that Eliashib had a grandson Jonathan (= Johanan, Neh 12²²). So, it is said, we must conclude that 'Nehemiah lived during the high-priesthood of Eliashib, and Ezra under that of his grandson' and that 'we have an interesting piece of corroborative evidence from two of the Elephantine papyri. From these we learn that Jehohanan was high priest in Jerusalem in 408 B.C. As Ezra lived under his high-priesthood, it is clear that when . . . it is said in Ezr 7¹ and Neh 2¹ that Ezra and Nehemiah came to Jerusalem in the seventh and twentieth years of Artaxerxes respectively, without specifying which Artaxerxes is meant, we must understand that in the case of Nehemiah it was Artaxerxes I 464-424, and therefore the year 444 B.C., while in the case of Ezra it was Artaxerxes II 404-359, and therefore the year

¹ *History of Israel*, ii. 117.

397 B.C.¹ Q.E.D. ! If Ezra's work was done under the high-priesthood of Jehohanan and Nehemiah's under that of his grandfather there is nothing more to be said. But is it as simple as that?

But first there is no suggestion of any kind whatever that the Jehohanan into whose chamber Ezra went was high priest, and the Chronicler's usage suggests that he was not. For, when Eliashib comes into the story, the Chronicler is always careful to mention that he is the high priest (Neh 3¹.²⁰ 13⁴.²⁸). So, if Jehohanan had been high priest at the time, he would have written 'I went into the chamber of the high priest,' as when he refers to Eliashib's house (Neh 3²⁰) he calls it 'the house of Eliashib the high priest.' So then the idea that 'Ezra lived under the high-priesthood of Jehohanan' is pure supposition.

Secondly, there is no need to equate the Jehohanan of Ezra's time with the man of the same name who was the grandson of Eliashib. Of course, if Jehohanan were an unusual name such an identification would have some probability. But the name is even more common than its equivalent John is amongst us. For fifteen persons of this name are found in the Chronicler's writings, five in the Maccabees and seventeen more in Josephus.³ It would therefore seem a little rash to say without any evidence that two uses of this name must apply to the same person.³ If in Ezr 10⁶ Jehohanan is literally the son of Eliashib, then it will follow that Eliashib had two sons Joiada and Jehohanan. When Joiada had a son in his turn, he named him after his brother Jehohanan. It was quite a common proceeding in the Old Testament for a child to be named after its uncle as in England to-day. We find that Jehoshaphat had a son Azariah and a grandson of the same name, 2 Ch 21² and 22⁶. Similarly Athaliah, daughter of Ahab, named her son Ahaziah (2 K 8²⁶), after her brother Ahaziah, the son of Ahab (1 K 22⁵¹).

Thirdly, that Jehohanan had a Temple chamber does not in any way imply that he was high priest. These chambers were used as store chambers for tithe, Neh 10³⁷, or for treasure, Ezr 8²⁹, as quarters for priests or even temple-singers according to the M.T. in Ezk 40⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶, and in Neh 13⁵ we even find that Eliashib had let Tobiah the Ammonite occupy one of them.

So then we may assume that in 457 Jehohanan was serving in the Temple in some subordinate

position and occupying the chamber in virtue of that office or of his relationship with Eliashib. This would fit certain facts in the rest of the story that are not often noticed. We find in Neh 13²⁸ that Nehemiah in the year 432 was contemporary with a full grown and married grandson of Eliashib. 'One of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high priest, was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me.' That Nehemiah was contemporary with a grandson of Eliashib in 432 exactly fits the view that Ezra was contemporary with a son of the same person twenty-five years before in 457. Incidentally the Chronicler's phrase 'Joiada the son of Eliashib the high priest' suggests that it was Joiada not Eliashib who was then high priest, *i.e.*, that Eliashib had died by 432. For in an exactly parallel phrase 'Joshua the son of Jehozadak the high priest' it is clearly Joshua, not Jehozadak who is high priest.

That the Elephantine Papyri mention a Jehohanan as high priest in 407 B.C. is often quoted as proof of the late date for Ezra. But it is nothing of the kind unless we assume that Jehohanan was high priest in the time of Ezra, and that Jehohanan, the son of Eliashib, is identical with Jonathan, the grandson of Eliashib—both of which assumptions we have seen to be groundless.

(4) It is said that 'None of those named as returning with Ezra (Ezr 8¹⁻¹⁴), are mentioned as helping Nehemiah to build the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3).' ⁴ This is not a serious objection, for of the total of 1496 who returned with Ezra only sixteen are mentioned by name. Moreover the list of builders in Neh 3 is quite obviously not a complete list of all individual builders, but of the leaders of contingents. Furthermore, Meshullam who came with Ezra (Ezr 8¹⁶) may well be the same person as the Meshullam who built under Nehemiah (Neh 3⁴.³⁰). And when Ezra arrived he gave his treasure to Meremoth the son of Uriah (Ezr 8³³) who is mentioned as one of Nehemiah's builders (Neh 3⁴.²¹). This in itself puts the 397 date out of the question. Here, again, a second glance reveals that an argument adduced for the late date really supports the early date.

(5) It is pointed out that Neh 12²⁶ speaks of 'Nehemiah the governor, and of Ezra the priest, the scribe,' in that order. But that proves nothing. It is perfectly possible for someone to speak of people in the reverse of their chronological order, *e.g.*, G. A. Smith held that Ezra came first, but he once referred to Nehemiah and Ezra ⁵ though elsewhere he has the reverse order.

It would, therefore, appear that the difficulties

⁴ H. Wheeler Robinson, *History of Israel*, 151.

⁵ *Expositor*, 7th ser., ii. 8.

¹ Oesterley, *op. cit.*, 115 f.

² See Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, p. clxxi.

³ Oesterley (*op. cit.*, 122) doubts whether Eliashib of Neh 13⁴ is the same person as Eliashib of Neh 3¹. Jehohanan is a far commoner name than Eliashib and so is far more likely to refer to several persons.

alleged to belong to the Chronicler's account disappear on closer inspection. Therefore there seems to be no good reason for refusing to accept this our only available evidence.

Positive Considerations.

(1) Ezra brought a law but took no steps to enforce it except in the matter of mixed marriages. Nehemiah introduced no new law: he enforced standards that were apparently already accepted but widely ignored. Moreover the standards that he enforced were exactly those introduced by Ezra. We find (Neh 13) that on his second visit Nehemiah carried out the following programme: (1) He turned Tobiah a foreigner out of the Temple chamber which he was occupying. (2) He saw that the Levites got their tithes. (3) He stopped Sabbath trade. (4) He dealt with mixed marriages and ejected a priest who had contracted such a marriage with a daughter of Sanballat. (5) He arranged for a wood offering for the Temple. All but the first of these are enacted with minor differences of detail in the terms of the covenant imposed by Ezra in Neh 10 after the introduction of his law. Or conversely of the seven clauses of that covenant five were enforced by Nehemiah. So marked is the correspondence that Torrey (*Ezra Studies*, 248) declares that the Nehemiah of Neh 13 is 'simply Ezra (*i.e.* the Chronicler) under another name.' Batten replies quite rightly that 'there is, indeed, enough resemblance to lend colour to such a view. But the differences are too marked to make it tenable' (*I.C.C.*, 46). Others (including Batten, *I.C.C.*, 373), say that the covenant of Neh 10 should really be ascribed to Nehemiah and placed after Neh 13. But there seems to be no evidence for this change which is merely required to evade the difficulties created by accepting the priority of Nehemiah. Ezra evidently appeared on the scene as the purveyor of an unknown law. Only so could he arouse the curiosity described in Neh 8 which made the people demand to hear what its terms were. This curiosity before the reading and the deep impression afterwards would be quite unthinkable if Ezra was merely enacting things which Nehemiah had enforced only thirty-five years before without pleading any special authority. Nor is it easy to see what authority Nehemiah could plead for his reforms if there were no existing law which authorized them. But once grant the priority of Ezra and you have a perfectly intelligible sequence. Ezra the scribe and theorist arrived in 457 and introduced a law, but was not able to enforce it. Nehemiah arrived fourteen years later, and being a man of action and an administrator he was able to enforce the law already introduced, or as much of it as he thought practicable.

(2) The question of mixed marriages is sometimes mentioned as if it were evidence for the priority of Nehemiah. In fact, it is quite the reverse. Batten, *e.g.*, says 'Nehemiah . . . was the first to discover mixed marriages and to apply a sharp remedy. Such a condition would not arise naturally after the wholesale dissolution as described in Ezr 9 f.'¹ This is no argument. Batten can only say that Nehemiah was the first to discover mixed marriages by assuming the truth which he is trying to prove, *i.e.*, the priority of Nehemiah. If Nehemiah came first we must assume that his handling of the question was a failure and that Ezra had to take more drastic steps to meet the case by insisting on the actual divorce of foreign wives instead of Nehemiah's more humane policy of merely requiring parents to take an oath not to allow their children to intermarry. In fact Ezra would have been completing that which Nehemiah tried in vain to achieve. If, however, Ezra came first, then clearly his efforts in the matter were a failure because they were too drastic, and that, surely, is the inherently likely result of such an effort to break up a number of already established marriages. So Nehemiah had to replace these measures, which had completely broken down, and in their place he put a more reasonable scheme which aimed at prevention rather than cure. But if Ezra had actually been the crown and completion in this matter, as the Chronicler thought he was in other matters, surely the Chronicler would have stressed it. By putting him first he makes him a failure. Therefore, it is not likely that anything but hard facts would have caused him to do so. That the work of Ezra was such that it could be represented as a failure is suggested by the list of Israel's heroes in Sir 49 which devotes four lines to Nehemiah but passes over Ezra in silence.

(3) How are we to explain the utter absence of Samaritan opposition to Ezra in strong contrast to the opposition that Nehemiah encountered from the very beginning? The most reasonable explanation is that some one had preceded Nehemiah and stirred up the trouble that was awaiting him. On the other hand, since Ezra was not opposed, it would seem to follow that he came into a situation that was peaceable. There is little weight in the plea that Nehemiah's quarrel was personal and political, not religious, and that therefore Ezra, whose work was religious, not political, would not be a victim of the hatred stirred up by Nehemiah if he followed him. Politics and religion were too closely connected to allow such a dichotomy. It is impossible to explain the lack of opposition encountered by Ezra if he comes in the period

¹ *I.C.C.*, 28.

when the bitterness left by Nehemiah's actions was leading up to the Samaritan schism.

(4) The Samaritan Pentateuch must also be taken into consideration. The Samaritans must have got it from the Jews sometime between its completion, which can hardly have been before Ezra, and the Samaritan schism, probably *c.* 330. For they would not have accepted a totally new book after the schism. The 397 date for Ezra creates serious difficulties here. It would mean that the Samaritans accepted as *the* authoritative book of their faith a work which came from those who had stirred their religious and political passions in 444 over the building of the wall, in 432 through Nehemiah's treatment (on his second visit) of the son-in-law of Sanballat their governor, and again in 397. These difficulties become even greater if we hold with L. E. Browne (*op. cit.*, ch. 10) that Ezra's law was D. For then P has to be introduced and the whole Pentateuch edited between 397 and 330. We must also remember that Nehemiah's efforts were specifically directed against the Samaritans, that by being made governor of Samaria he interfered with their governor Sanballat's ambitions and that he insulted him by ejecting his son-in-law. We have seen that the plea that the opposition is purely personal and political is not valid. Moreover, whenever the Temple on Mt. Gerizim was actually built the schism seems ultimately to have been due to the ejection of the grandson of Eliashib who had married Sanballat's daughter. It is therefore extremely improbable that the Samaritans would have taken as their authoritative revelation a book introduced after this event and owing much to a man whose attitude was even more uncompromising than Nehemiah's. But it is quite natural that they should have taken it from Ezra before they realized in which direction things were going.

(5) Certain considerations suggest that the Chronicler is more reliable on the period of Ezra and Nehemiah than in the Books of Chronicles. He possesses genuine memoirs of Nehemiah and probably of Ezra. For Torrey's view, that what appear to be memoirs of Ezra are really the

Chronicler's fiction, does not seem to be supported by the evidence. For the Ezra of the memoirs, though the Chronicler's hero, is not the figure the Chronicler would have invented for himself. He would have created more of a priestly figure. The pages of the Chronicles abound with references to priests (103 times) while scribes are little mentioned. But the Ezra of the memoirs though a priest is primarily a scribe, in fact far less a priestly figure than Jeshua the son of Jozadak. Again the Chronicler's work shows little Deuteronomic influence, while such influence is strong in the Ezra memoirs—so strong indeed that Welch (*Post-Exilic Judaism*) would ascribe part of them to an earlier N. Israelite source while L. E. Browne holds that Ezra based his work on D. Or, again, opponents of the theory that Ezra and Nehemiah are the work of the Chronicler have shown that in various details the ritual described in Ezra and Nehemiah is less advanced than that of his Chronicles. This does not necessarily disprove common authorship. But it does suggest that while on the earlier periods the Chronicler was able to paint history by the light of doctrine, he is here limited by a more accurate knowledge of the facts. Indeed he may well have lived little more than half-a-century after the proposed late date for Ezra.¹ At so brief an interval he is very unlikely to have been ignorant whether Ezra was only fifty years before his day and came after Nehemiah or whether he was over a century before his day and before Nehemiah.

It would seem then that the Chronicler's original account (preserved at this point in 1 Es) gives us a clear and consistent view of the dates and relations of Ezra and Nehemiah, based in part on contemporary memoirs.

The objections to his dating of Ezra and Nehemiah will not bear detailed examination while it is supported by a number of considerations, and should therefore be accepted unless fresh evidence is forthcoming.

¹ Oesterley, *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* (p. 112), dates the Chronicler to 'the second half of the fourth century,' others even earlier. See *Record and Revelation*, 85-87.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

The Eye on My Shoulder.

BY THE REVEREND D. H. WHITEFORD, B.D., C.F.,
2ND BATTALION SCOTS GUARDS.

'Thou God seest me.'—Gn 16¹³.

ON the shoulder of my battle-dress blouse I wear an 'eye.' A silver 'eye' on a blue shield bordered

by a red line. It is the sign worn by every soldier serving in the Guards' Division. Most boys and girls, I think, know that each Division in the Army has its own particular sign. The men from the Highland Division, for example, were marked by a blue square on the shoulder with the letters HD woven on it in red. The soldiers who fought in the 15th Scottish Division were proud to wear on their sleeve the red Lion Rampant of Scotland.

You could always tell a man who came from the Lowland Division because on his shoulder you would find a small blue shield with the cross of Saint Andrew cutting across it.

These three Divisions, at least, all chose as their distinguishing and distinctive signs a lion, or a cross, or some lettering that linked them visibly and unquestionably with the part of the country from which they came, and of which they were proud. The Guards' Division, however, chose an 'eye.' When you come to think of it, that is surely a very strange sign to adopt. One might have thought that since the Guards' Regiments are in a very special sense the King's Troops, they would wear a crown or a sceptre or a sign of some kind showing their connexion with the Royal Household. But no! They wear a plain 'eye.' Why?

If you were to ask any of the men who wear the 'eye' what tradition and explanation lie behind their sign, they would tell you a story something like this:

During the First World War the Guards' Division was called upon to perform a very sticky piece of fighting. So vital and crucial was the operation allotted to it that the Divisional Commander issued to his men a special Order of the Day. In it he asked them to uphold the very high traditions of the Brigade of Guards; he reminded them that they were the King's Troops; and he impressed upon them that when they joined battle on the morrow the eyes of the whole world would be upon them. The Brigade of Guards never forgot that sentence. It stuck. That is the standard that they wished to keep. A high standard, that the eyes of the whole world can watch them and be proud of them. And that is the reason why to-day they wear an 'eye.' They are the King's Troops, and his eye is upon them; but they are watched also by the eyes of the whole world.

Now, I thought, when I first heard that tale, that it contains a lesson we would all do well to learn. For whether we are soldiers or citizens or schoolboys, because we are Christians, then, surely we are in the truest sense of all, the King's men. Christ's eye is upon us; and because we are His men, then, the eyes of the world are glued upon us also. They watch to see whether we are true to Him or not. They watch to pick out the faults in us. These eyes are quick to notice where we fail, and they are quick, also, because of our conduct, to throw mud at the name of our King. Do we bring credit or disrepute to the name of Christ?

Often the eye of the world is upon us when we are least aware of it watching us, when we think that it is asleep. But whether the eye of the world watches us and notes what we do and how we behave or not, the important thing to remember is that God sees us. For we are Christ's boys and girls. We are His soldiers. Samuel Rutherford of Anwoth, one of the great men of the Scottish Church, many years ago summed up all that I have been trying to say in a letter which he wrote to Lord Lowden. This is what he wrote. 'The

eye of Christ is upon you. . . . Be valiant for your royal King. Contend for Him.'

Passing It On.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'He passed by.'—Lk 10³¹.

Three children had each of them seen it that morning as they came downstairs—the unfastened stair-rod. Billy was first. 'Ah-ha!' he said. 'Somebody will trip over that loose runner if that rod isn't fastened.' But Billy had a great deal to do so he carefully stepped over it, and then forgot all about it. Anne, too, noticed it, but she was already late for school, and hadn't a moment to spare. So she also stepped very carefully over the dangerous bit, and so downstairs. Michael, the youngest, shook his head wisely, saying that really Billy and Anne should not have left that stair-rod the way it was, and, so reflecting, went off to school. Ten minutes later Father came downstairs. He *didn't* notice the loose rod, or the slack runner, and he descended much faster than he had intended. Then, when Father had said all he had to say about people who left stair-rods unfastened, Mother went up and fixed the rod as it should be.

Each of these young folk was just passing on to somebody else a job they ought themselves to have tackled. They were busy, or hurried, or, thinking it was somebody else's business, didn't see why they should do it. It was just like what happened in Jesus' story of the Good Samaritan. They 'passed by.' We are often guilty of that sort of thing, and shirk our responsibilities, leaving it to the other person.

Don't just pass it on. The world would have been saved a lot of sorrow, and many wrong things would have been righted, if everybody had faced his duty and accepted his responsibility. Don't ever try to escape by saying, 'Why should I?' Say instead, 'Here am I on the spot: it's up to me.'

There's another kind of passing-on, however, which is to be commended. Going into the Public Library lately, somebody held the swing-door open for me. 'Thanks,' I said, and smiled. At that moment a lady approached from the other side, so I held the door open for her. 'Thanks,' she said, and smiled. I paused a moment, and saw a third person entering the Library. The lady held the door open for him, whereupon he said 'Thanks,' and smiled. I didn't wait longer, but I wondered how long they kept it up—passing on the kindness they had received. How far that smile might have gone, travelling from face to face, if each of these people had made a Chain of Kindness, all of them doing something kind because somebody had been kind to them! What a long line of kindnesses! Why, the man who started it might even have met it again long years afterwards, and never guessed it was he who first set it in motion!

It must have been so with Jesus. You could trace His progress through the Holy Land by the light on the faces of the people He had met, and

blessed, and healed, and forgiven. And the gladness spread, for no one could keep it to themselves. They passed it on.

God meant that we should not keep to ourselves the kindnesses we receive. They don't really altogether belong to us. Keep them in circulation. Let that smile pass down the line. Let that kindness speed on its cheering way. Where will they end? Why should they ever end? You may help, by passing them on, to make a brighter, happier world.

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Security.

BY THE REVEREND ROLF GLEDHILL, M.A., B.D.,
ST. GERMAIN'S VICARAGE, EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM.

'Everyone who listens to these words of mine and does not act upon them will be like a stupid man who built his house on sand.'—Mt 7²⁶ (Moffatt).

The general impression still seems to be that 'Reported Missing' is the most accurate description. Many have a vague feeling that 'Believed Killed' is incorrect. He is missing. He is no longer present. He is numbered among the war-time casualties.

The One to whom I refer is God. So many people by their life and actions report that He is missing. God is not a living reality. He is not present guiding and controlling people's lives. So, first of all, worship slackens. Then morality slumps. First comes the inner collapse—then the outward failure, seen in discord, dishonesty, strife, greed, war, brutality, mass-extirmination. Many turn back from the horror, and cry out for peace. Peace, peace! There will be no real peace in the outer world, and no real peace between the nations, until there is peace in the hearts of men and women. Peace can only be built on the real inner foundations. There is a forgotten, neglected side of our being. Those who are conscious of failure and frustration try to escape. But in all their efforts they are trying to run away from themselves—from those forgotten, unloved parts of themselves that clamour for attention. Our greatest need in these days is to recapture the sense of the nearness of God. We need to realize more and more fully that without Him our lives are broken and incomplete. He alone is the Rock, and gives us security.

Jesus gave a stern warning to those who neglect His way. He compared it to the folly of building one's house on the sand. There is only one possible end. When the storm comes, the house will collapse. This picture, and this warning, were based on personal experience. The Carpenter of Nazareth knew that some people chose the easy way, and decided to build a house on the sandy river bed. But as soon as the winter rains caused a flood that house would be doomed. No house is stronger than the foundation on which it is built.

Some years ago Winchester Cathedral was in

danger of collapse; and so the foundations had to be examined. It was found that the original building had been erected on marshy soil; and so only by underpinning the foundations with concrete could the Cathedral be saved. No house is stronger than the foundations on which it is built.

Building a house, building a cathedral—or building a character, it is all the same. Everything depends on the foundation. Nominally, we in this country build on the Christian foundation. But we have not to look far to find how many prefer building on the sand. Some choose the quicksands of pleasure; others the shifting sands of 'do-as-you-please.' But for all who build life, or home, or character on the sand, the inevitable end is collapse.

Of course, it is so much easier to turn our eyes away from ourselves, and from the foundations on which we build our life, and to see the cause of all our troubles in some one else—some other person or some other nation. This attitude was once challenged by a writer in these words: 'You complain of the aggression of foreign enemies; yet, if the foreign enemy were to cease from troubling would Englishman really live at peace with Englishman? If the external danger by armed barbarians were to be stamped out, should we not be exposed to a fiercer and heavier civil bombardment on the home-front, in the shape of calumnies, and injuries, inflicted by the powerful upon their weaker fellow-citizens? You complain of crop-failures and famine; yet the greatest famines are made not by drought but by greed, and the most flagrant distress springs from profiteering.'

Does this sound modern? It was written over one thousand five hundred years ago by Cyprian. It was a warning against this tendency to look outside and elsewhere for our enemy. It was a warning against building on the sand. It was a warning against neglecting the real inner foundation which is the only guarantee of stability. One alteration was made in that quotation. The word 'Roman' was changed to 'Englishman.' But the same message applies to us. The great Roman Empire fell. History repeats itself. The civilizations that build on sand are foredoomed to extinction. Arnold Toynbee in his *Study of History* has told of twenty-one civilizations. Many are buried in the dust of oblivion, but all have perished for the same reason. They all died from within—because they had built on the sand. Never once in the records of history can it be found that a civilization disappeared because of plague, or famine, or foes. All died from within—from internal moral weakness. Man's biggest enemy is himself.

So we need to turn from the busy world with its many calls on our time and attention to consider our own interior life. Is it being built on a rock, on a firm foundation? Is there something we ought to be doing because we have accepted the Christian standard as the moral foundation of our life? There is very clearly a call for action. So many thinkers and writers have sensed the great

need. One of the last articles by Stephen Leacock, the famous American economist and humorist, was called 'I'm going to be a New Man.' 'Just now,' he wrote, 'we are all filled with the idea of post-war reconstruction, rebuilding the railways, recharting the air, shovelling up the cities. I propose as a first need for the post-war world THAT YOU RECONSTRUCT YOURSELF A LITTLE. . . . How trivial are the things we fuss about. . . . I've seen friends drift apart over golf—just because one could play better, but the other counted better. . . . I'll tell you why I want this reconstruction. I don't believe we can mend our broken world without it. Treaties and compacts, legislation and pledges, are worthless without the heart and spirit of the people. . . . I'm going to start anyway. I'm going to pretend I'm the kindest, friendliest fellow . . . AND YOU START TOO. Don't wait for the rebuilding and the recharting . . . and all the things you talk about. YOU BEGIN.'

Begin? Where? On real solid foundations. These pillars of security are easy for us to find. As Paul wrote to his friends at Corinth: 'the foundation is laid.' 'The foundation is laid, namely Jesus Christ, and no one can lay any other.' It is for us, by prayer and worship, by thought and deed, to seek to build our life upon this Rock.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Inescapable Tensions of Life.

'In a strait betwixt two.'—Ph 1²².

The new psychology has added several words to our working vocabulary, and one of them is the word 'integration.' The psychologist tells us that the fundamental evil of our human nature is its state of interior warfare, the disturbing pressures and upthrusts of subconscious forces which are not in line with the chosen purposes of the conscious will. The ideal of spiritual health which the psychologist sets up in contrast to this is the ideal of 'integrated' personality. I think he would whole-heartedly accept Sir William Watson's lines:

'Tis human fortune's happiest height, to be
A spirit melodious, lucid, poised, and whole.

No one will presumably be concerned to deny the validity of this ideal, or fail to be grateful to the thinkers who have expounded it so forcibly to our generation.

But when this has been accepted as sound and helpful insight, two important questions remain to be answered. The first is this: how is this integration to be attained? And the second is this: supposing it to be attainable, are we at liberty to hope that by its attainment every element of strain and tension will be eliminated from our souls? About the former question we say nothing but this. The new psychology has already proved itself to be a valuable ally to religion, but no substitute for it. When one can drive an electric motor by a diagram instead of a dynamo, it will

be time to turn to Freud for salvation instead of to Christ. It is about the latter question we wish to speak, and to say in answer to it that in the measure in which a man does achieve unity of personality—which means, according to the Christian way of thinking, in the measure in which he attains to the knowledge and love of God revealed in His Son Jesus Christ—in that very measure he will find himself exposed to certain tensions from which he will not wish to escape. Let us consider three of these inescapable tensions.

First, the Christian recognizes the contradiction between Nature and Supernature, and willingly accepts the tension which is set up within the soul, since it belongs to both realms. We belong to this natural world with all its familiar, homely, and so far manageable claims and experiences. But in the very midst of all our human happiness and business we belong to a supernatural order and feel its thrust and impact upon our souls. Nowhere perhaps is this contradiction more piercingly felt than in our highest experiences of beauty, in which an element of pain always strangely mingles.

Just when we are safest, there's a sunset-touch,
A fancy from a flower-bell, some one's death, . . .
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears
As old and new at once as nature's self,
To rap and knock and enter in our soul.

Now the danger is that men should seek to find their soul's harmony on one side or the other of this contradiction between Nature and Supernature. Some immerse themselves in the life of the natural order, dutifully in a self-forgetting attempt to serve the world. An illustration of this kind of spirit is afforded in a letter which Dale of Birmingham once wrote, although the letter does imperfect justice to the total character of Dale. A good old lady had sent him a little book of devotions at a time when he was absorbed in political activities, urging him to take more time to look after his own soul. Dale replied, 'I have forgotten that I have a soul. I can trust Christ to look after my soul while I am busy in the work of His Kingdom.' Others attempt the solution of the contradiction by withdrawing themselves as much as possible from the claims of the natural order into a life of cloistered spirituality. You remember the famous words of Newman: 'Sublime, unlooked-for doctrine, but most true. To every one of us there are but two beings in the whole world, himself and God: for, as to this outward scene, its pleasures and pursuits, its honours and cares, its contrivances, its personages, its kingdoms, its multitudes of busy slaves, what are they to us?—nothing, no more than a show.' But both these types of outlook and action, even when they are nobly exemplified as in the instances given, inevitably fail to satisfy. For, as some one has said, 'If we occupy ourselves exclusively with the world, even for the purpose of serving it, we become worldly, superficial, unreal, and ineffective.' And, on the other hand, 'a fugitive and cloistered virtue' can only exist and flourish on the basis of the labours of the multitude

of busy slaves, and must therefore be condemned as parasitic if at no point it endures the dust and heat of life's race. No, we must continually endure within our souls the contradiction between Nature and Supernature, taking our part in all the homely joys and pressing duties of the one order, but retiring of set purpose and according to a regular plan into the other in order there to lay our souls open to the infinite claim of God which alone can save us from triviality, and to His divine encouragement which alone can save us from defeat and despair.

Secondly, there is the struggle between good and evil. There is indeed a type of ostensible Christianity which shirks the combat. Do we not all know a kind of domestic Christianity which, regarded in abstraction, is seen to be sincere and admirable enough—the Christianity of the home full of affection and gentleness, but all too apt to shut out behind close-drawn curtains the sight and sound of the world's pain? Do not we all know a type of congregational life within the Church of Christ which, regarded by itself, is no despicable example of human association, being distinguished within its own limits by brotherly feeling and mutual service, but which, nevertheless can be strangely and stubbornly deaf to the manifold calls of our time for eager and resolute fighters in the cause of God?

Too much and too often the Church has sought its own peace in the secluded safety and comforts of what are so aptly called 'Church circles'—circles of which, no doubt, the centre is Jesus Christ in a real sense, but of which the circumference is often drawn narrowly and for the very purpose, as it would almost appear in some cases, of excluding the trying strains and pressures of the world's evils. No wonder that this kind of Church, evading Gethsemane, has not saved the world from Gehenna. For the symbol of Christianity is never a circle returning upon itself and secluding good from evil within a safe and calculated boundary, but always and only a cross. On the other hand, we see those who do not shirk the combat with the world's evils; but the battle-cries upon their lips are sometimes strident and bitter, and their bearing gives no hint that they themselves know anything of a peace which passes understanding. Alas, for all their force and fire, lives like these often only increase the world's confusion. The crying need of our time is for a new race of men and women who have received from Jesus Christ His own gift of peace and joy, and who for that very reason are able and willing to grapple with the evil that is in the world. Such men and women will be strong enough to stand 'in a strait betwixt two,' between the peace of God and the malignant evils of the world. God forgive us when we either reject the Cross and try to find our peace within some comfortable circle, or take up our cross in the name of righteousness and use it as a weapon of offence.

Lastly, the Christian, living in the world of time, feels already upon his life the impact of eternity. The first Christian preachers were nobly sure that the destiny which was theirs in Christ would only

be fully opened out to them on the other side of death. Sometimes this persuasion breaks out in majestic music, as when St. Peter, preparing the Church to face impending persecution, utters his great doxology: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. . . .' Sometimes it tolls like a solemn warning-bell, as when St. Paul says: 'For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. . . .' Sometimes, as in the text we started from, it sings a song, an old man's song of longing and expectation: 'For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better. . . . For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. . . .' Everywhere this persuasion of the glory of the life to come, this stretching out of the horizons of human destiny, is the very condition of the strength, patience, and effectiveness of these first heroic believers and pioneers of the Church. If we are to live in any deep sense fruitfully and strongly, our horizons must include the life to come, and our souls feel the impact of those realms beyond sense and time towards which we move.¹

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Deeds, not Words.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY,
D.D., GLASGOW.

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'—Mt 7²¹.

In that book which is a purification to read—Dean Church's *History of the Oxford Movement*—one is struck with a certain quality of spirit which is continually being stressed and underlined. Of the leaders, men like Keble, Newman, Hurrell Froude, and Isaac Williams, phrases like these constantly recur, 'They hated show and mistrusted excitement,' 'Men were challenged to examine the meaning of their words,' 'They had a horror of flashy sentiment and fine talking,' 'They scorned anything that seemed like display, or the desire of applause or of immediate effect.' Words like these are after Christ's own heart. They illumine the austere warning of the text 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'

Here, in the first place, is set before us *Christ the Realist*.

It were 'bark and tonic' for the mind to accompany Christ through the pages of the New Testament and see this realism at work. Again and again we see His insistence on *reality* in religion,

¹ A. C. Craig, *University Sermons*, 124.

the necessity of harnessing exulting emotion instantaneously to hard, clamant duty. The disciples would fain have lingered amid the ecstasies of the Mount of Transfiguration, but Jesus hastens to lead them down the mountainside to confront them with a case of desperate human need. Repeatedly, we see Jesus 'challenging men to examine the meaning of their words.' Three men come to Him, one after the other, with exuberant expressions of devotion but He turns them all down. Each was hampered by a proviso—'Lord, I will follow thee, *but*—' 'Lord let me *first*.' Better these men should face reality at the outset than afterwards disappoint both their master and themselves. Again the goodness and severity of Jesus are most strikingly evinced in His treatment of the Rich Young Ruler. We read that 'He looked upon him and loved him.' Nevertheless, even for such a promising recruit, Jesus refused to whittle down His terms. To his high-wrought emotions He applied the acid test. 'Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come, follow me.' Speaking one day in the open air, as was His wont, Jesus has deeply moved the hearts of His listeners. From the edge of the crowd comes the warm, motherly exclamation of a woman, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee.' Quickly, almost peremptorily, Jesus replies, 'Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.' Then there is the parable of the man in a state of warm emotion, faced with the challenge to work in the vineyard, who exclaims, 'I go, sir'—and went not. By inference, Jesus commends the man whose zeal took time to kindle—'but afterwards, repented and went.' All this insistence is summed up in the realism of the text—'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' And to precept Christ added example. Once stern duty is to be faced, His word is 'Rise, let us be going'—'He set his face steadfastly towards Jerusalem.'

On each glance of thought
Decision followed, as the thunderbolt
Pursues the flash.

Teaching and example like this have nothing cryptic about them. He that runs may read. There is a double Nemesis that follows all failure to add to swelling emotion the ardent deed. In the first place it softens the will, and deceives the conscience, so that weak sentimentalism can end in cold inhumanity. Witness the famous case of the lady in Tolstoy's story, emerging from the theatre with the tears streaming down her face to find her waiting driver frozen to death in his sledge!

With these warnings before us let us see to it that 'the firstlings of our hearts become the firstlings of our hands.' Let there be no yawning gulf between the kindled vision and the prompt obedience. Otherwise there follow the continual corrosions of conscience and the neglected duties that render our high-flying pietism unreal and farcical.

The other corollary will be obvious. Such inconsistency is rare sport for the Philistines. Let us give no cynical outsider fuel for his cynicism as he notes the glaring discrepancy between promise and performance.

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' These words have a further implication. *They emphasize the vital connexion between intellectual certainty and practical well-doing.* Every one of us has moods of honesty and insight; when, becoming surgical, we probe to the roots of our unbelief and depression. Prompted by Christ the Realist, we discover that most of our hesitation and uncertainty results from *failing to act up to the light we have.* Not more light but more will is what we need. To put this in another way. Moods of realism like these question our *right* to many of our 'doubts.' It were more honest to call them by their real names—rebellions, compromises, hidden faithlessnesses and treacheries known only to ourselves and God. The Old Testament and the New echo each other here. 'Commit thy *works* unto the Lord, and thy *thoughts* shall be established.' 'He that *doeth the will* shall know of the doctrine.' As James Martineau has it: 'There is nothing true in heaven and earth, if it be not the law of God that holy deed shall end in holy thought and holy love.' We, in our self-ignorance, tend to reverse this order. We say to ourselves so speciously: 'If only I were certain of the will of God how I would leap to perform it.' *Would we?* The late Dr. John Hutton had salutary words to rebut this kind of loose thinking, 'People wish for what they call "dead certainty" in religion. With many people who do not know themselves that is just what it would be—"a dead certainty." Not till the pious word becomes the completed deed does it become a *living certainty*.' Let us heed the warning. One fervid 'costing' deed of sacrificial love will give us clearer light on the mind and will of God than a hundred speculations that lead nowhere. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'

Lastly, *these words are a scathing commentary on an unbalanced devotionism.*

Moffatt's translation has a word in season here. The first verse in the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians—immediately following on the imperishable Hymn to Love—reads, 'Make love your aim, and then set your heart on the spiritual gifts.' Which of us but needs the implied warning? The very urge towards spirituality may become a snare and a delusion. It may become a most unattractive kind of self-centredness. Lately I came across this shrewd comment on the great Apostle. 'St. Paul had not a *hypersensitive interest in his own character*.' Too many of us, I fear, just have! In our very earnestness we seek to batter and bruise ourselves into spirituality. We retire from the uninviting duty into our cloistered room. We take our spiritual temperatures. We assess our veering moods, and it all defeats itself! Our prayers are

clogged with self-centred anxieties and 'miserable aims that end in self'—my sins, my work, my career, my responsibility, my ambitions even towards spirituality. Who shall deliver us from this bondage? *Christ the Realist*. His was never the danger of 'prayer for prayer's sake.' That way lies phantasy and day-dreaming and soft pietism. For Him prayer was never a luxuriating in emotion. It was putting on the armour for battle, girding the loins for the journey, trimming the lamp for the darkness.

So we return to the Apostle's word, 'Make love your aim—fill your life with the memory of hard duty faced, kind deeds accomplished—and let your "spirituality" take care of itself.' It will have nothing of the hothouse clinging to it. It will be infiltrated by the winds of heaven, 'the winds austere and pure.'

One often returns to the awe-inspiring vision of the last judgment narrated in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel. Note the beautiful *unconsciousness* of the blessed. 'When saw we thee an hungered, or naked, or in prison?' Such unconsciousness is the fine bloom on a truly Christian character. And whence is it derived? Not by running away from life and shutting oneself up within a library of devotional books, but by being down among men and human need and human sin and spending oneself in practical, sacrificial service—among hunger, and thirst and sickness and amid the prisoners.

Faith's meanest deed more favour bears,

Where hearts and wills are weighed,
Than brightest transports, choicest prayers
Which bloom their hour and fade.

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but *he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.*'

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Attainment of Wisdom.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR A. COWAN, D.D.,
EDINBURGH.

'Give thy servant therefore an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and evil.'—I K 3⁹ (R.V.).

The aged David had said to Solomon, 'Do therefore according to thy wisdom, for thou art a wise man'—the fine tribute of a father to his son! Then why did Solomon pray for wisdom when he was already reputed to be wise? The reason was that wisdom does not come to us ready made, sound judgment is not acquired all at once, but has to be constantly considered and reconsidered in the light of God. Here was a man who wished to keep his mind open to impressions and persuasions from God in changing times. What if he should fail to grasp the significance of what he was passing through and be merely aggrieved at it as hard lines or elated at it as good luck, should miss the rebuke, the challenge, or the promise in the panorama of events, and be none the wiser? Dorothy Sayers distinguishes between an event

and an experience: an *event* is something that happens to you—you do not see its meaning or notice any truth signalling behind it, and she quotes the young man in T. S. Eliot's play, *Family Reunion*, who says to his relatives:

You are all people

To whom nothing has happened, at most the
continual impact
Of eternal events. . . .

but an *experience* is an event which you interpret and express to your own mind, and understand for yourselves. It is a discovery of the clue to the problem, hitting the right trail, and exploring new ranges of reality. Solomon prayed that he might remain so sensitive to God's guidance as to assess the altering situation accurately. 'Give thy servant therefore an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and evil.'

When Solomon came to power, he began with a public recognition of God in the main sanctuary of the realm, and it was amid the sacred memories and hopes of the place of worship that he gave wisdom priority over any glittering prizes of the moment, and prayed for it as the highest good. What do we ask for in church at the beginning of a new era? What is our major concern? Solomon asked for sound judgment when a new epoch was opening. His dominant desire was for wisdom, insight into human motives, knowledge of the human heart, which would enable him to handle the situation justly and adequately. What he preferred to any profit or glamour was that he should be kept from mistaken choices and should learn to do the right thing as he went along. He selected from a number of seductive alternatives what was most desirable, necessary, and rewarding, and would equip him to cope effectively with whatever predicament might arise. 'Give thy servant therefore an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and evil.'

Augustine prayed, 'Lord, help me to know myself in my relations to Thee,' and Lincoln said, 'Faith in God is indispensable to successful statesmanship.' We cannot know ourselves or others unless we know God, we cannot have any insight into the springs of human action or understand our own nature and destiny and the nature and destiny of people in general unless we have confidence in the Divine character and purpose. The truth of things is in Him, and we must rely on Him and be taught by Him. Otherwise life becomes unintelligible and unmanageable, a crazy muddle, a pointless episode which does not make sense, and of which one can only exclaim, 'A mad world, my masters!' Solomon saw that it was only in dependence on God that his vision could be clarified and amplified. When Corot began his silver-grey landscapes, he started with the sky, because it is the sky that determines the lighting and the colour tone of the picture. So God must receive our first attention, because it is only when we look up in worship that we see the direction of the light and the quality of the light, and

perceive what is important and what is inconsiderable in the scene, what makes it an ordered harmony. It is the sky that gives us our scale of values; it is our view of God that creates our discrimination. Solomon began to govern by looking to heaven, and his dream in the place of worship showed him the pre-eminence of wisdom, and pulled his fragmentary impressions together into a unity. He attained wisdom because he went to God for it. You and I must do the same.

What was the wisdom attained? A sample of it was his proposal to settle the dispute between two women, who claimed to be the mother of a baby boy, by cutting the child in two and giving a half to each claimant. The real mother was discovered in the woman who felt so tenderly for the little fellow that she would rather part with him and let him belong to her rival than see him killed. This was mother-love coming out and revealed the rightful maternity of the child. 'A very clever trick!' some one may aver, but it was much more than a clever trick. It was shrewd, subtle, penetrating, and showed a real knowledge of the human heart and how to move it, in two ways. *Firstly*, a Government is worthy of respect only when it has a detective wisdom which can get behind the façade of imposture and foul play and find out the wrong and vindicate the right. No administration can win popular confidence unless it tracks down the guilty and brings them to justice, and the Crown loses some of its lustre, the judicature is suspect, the police are criticized, if miscreants are not traced and brought to book. The king satisfied the public conscience when he got to the truth of the matter and exposed the heart-breaking fraud and gave fair play to the innocent in this case. The populace hailed his judgment as the wisdom of God. *Secondly*, good government appeals to the best in sinful, erring human nature. What could the ruling power make of two women of easy virtue? Solomon sought to touch their hearts, awaken their finer feelings, evoke the mother-instinct in them. The great ruler is he who can so stir the higher impulses in his subjects that they are lifted to new heights of thought and action. True, only one woman rose to self-sacrifice in response to his appeal, while the other woman remained an impenitent cheat; his use of his authority to tap whatever was decent and trustworthy in human creatures had only a fifty per cent success; but the response of the one woman was a memorable example of what a true mother should be—ready to suffer rather than let her child perish, and it would be long recited at the camp-fire and the fireside. Good government adopts methods which appeal to the best in people and elicit their latent goodness. True statesmanship does not pander to selfish and mercenary motives, but stimulates the moral sense of the nation and rouses its soul. This was what Solomon did, and his subjects rejoiced in his judgment as the wisdom of God. Such was the wisdom he attained, and it combined an investigating justice with an inspiring suggestion.

His wisdom brought commercial and cultural prosperity to the nation and enhanced his prestige

with the neighbouring powers of Egypt and Tyre. But, alas! it was a limited wisdom, and it diminished with time as he lost touch with God. His policy degenerated as his religion dissolved. His knowledge of the human heart waned as his worship of God dwindled, he underrated men when he underrated God, till he became so harsh and oppressive that he left behind an ugly temper of popular discontent which later disrupted the nation. Thus people become wrong-headed when they lose their spiritual urge. Human society is perverse, irresponsible, and unworkable, if there is a widespread departure from the vision and ideals which once captured the heart in the place of worship. In an address at St. Martin's Church, Birmingham, on 11th May, Sir Stafford Cripps said: 'I believe most profoundly that what we are lacking to-day in our productive effort in this country is a Christian approach—a Christian background. Our industrial morale is low because a merely materialistic, self-centred outlook on our work cannot give us a high morale.'

But, listen! If we have lost our way by secularism, we can find it again by a vital religion. Seekers after wisdom, anxious inquirers, can be sure of an answer to their prayers for a misguided world, because 'God is rich in mercy to all who call upon Him.' It is a tonic to know that we need not grope and fumble in vain, because God is generous in sharing His mind with us, and He offers to give us sufficient moral intelligence for our task. In *Romola*, Tito is described as having 'an innate love of reticence, a talent for it'; he was secretive. But the supreme characteristic of God is not mystery; it is self-revelation, a passion to make Himself known. He proved how communicative, self-imparting, and redeeming He is in Christ and His cross. It is not the Divine purpose that poor, struggling humans should remain blundering and futile, but that they should have the insight and the impetus to arrive. 'Give thy servant therefore an understanding heart.' An answer to that prayer is guaranteed by the character of God, who is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and the attainment of wisdom is assured to those who make it their preference.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Glory of the Lord.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND JOHN FOSTER, D.D.,
SELLY OAK COLLEGES.

'We beheld his glory.'—Jn 1¹⁴.

One of the memorable events of last year was Dorothy Sayers' play, *The Just Vengeance*, at the Lichfield Cathedral festival. It was daring. We not only saw something of the Passion of our Lord, we saw the glory of God being laid aside when He became man. I was not shocked by the attempt. But I was impressed again with the impossibility of the portrayal. The mediæval monk tried, and his pictures in our eyes are childish and crude. Men have tried in painted windows, and the

failure is greatest in the mock-mediaeval. This attempt in the Cathedral, most reverently done, left me with the impression of tinsel gilt. The Bible uses vivid imagery with which to describe it, but once you try to translate those images into visual expression, the verdict is 'The glory of God is not like that.' Of the Carpenter of Nazareth, John writes, 'We beheld his glory.'

The writer was a Jew. When a Jew used the word 'glory' he would have in mind its special scriptural meaning. 'The cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle,' the *Shekinah*, the light in the storm-cloud marking Jehovah's presence with His people. The opening verses of the Fourth Gospel have the beginning of Genesis in mind: 'In the beginning God created . . . God said . . . light from the darkness'; 'In the beginning was the Word . . . all things were made by him . . . the light shineth in the darkness.' The writer has in mind not only these first words of the Old Testament but an account typical of Old Testament belief concerning God's glory: 'Moses used to take the tent and to pitch it without the camp, afar off from the camp . . . when Moses entered into the Tent, the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the Tent: . . . And all the people saw it. . . . And Moses said . . . Shew me, I pray thee, thy glory. . . . And he said, Thou canst not see my face: for man shall not see me and live.'

'The Word became flesh, and pitched his tent among us, and we beheld his glory. . . . No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son . . . hath declared him. . . . For the law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.'

That is what is summed up in this text: 'We saw the glory—saw again the light on the storm-cloud—in Him.'

The earliest Christian thought about the glory of Jesus, in the sermons in Acts and 1 Peter, may be represented by the words, 'the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them.' St. Paul goes further, adding to the doctrine of the Exaltation that of the Humiliation: 'He was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor.' 'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men . . . he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name.' The pre-existent Lord in glory; the Man Jesus, poor, empty, humbled; the risen Christ exalted to more abundant glory.

The writer to the Hebrews writes similarly of the Incarnation as a leaving of glory. He was 'made a little lower than the angels,' who before had 'inherited a more excellent name than they,' and then 'because of the suffering of death crowned with glory' again.

Two passages are worthy of special note. He 1³ speaks of Jesus as 'the effulgence of God's glory,' the *Shekinah's* concentrated blaze. But the writer is thinking of the pre-existent Lord. 2 Co 4⁶ says,

'God . . . shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' Paul, too, says he has seen the *Shekinah* in Jesus, but is he not thinking of the blinding light which shone on the Damascus road?

John is different from them all. What Peter sees in the risen Christ, John had seen already in the earthly Jesus. What Paul and 'Hebrews' think of Jesus as leaving behind in heaven, John says Jesus showed men on earth. Peter might have joined with us in singing, 'The head that once was crowned with thorns is crowned with glory now.' John saw the glory through the thorns. Paul's words lie behind our hymn, 'He laid his glory by, He wrapped him in our clay.' These are the words of John, 'He became flesh, and we beheld his glory.' There is nothing like it in the whole of Scripture. The Old Testament glory was one of separation. When the light on the storm-cloud appeared over the Tabernacle each poor tribesman fell down beside his tent door and worshipped. When a prophet 'looked, and, behold, a stormy wind came out of the north, a great cloud, with a fire flashing continually, and a brightness round about it,' we can imagine his awe as he prostrated himself. His eyes had seen the glory and he was afraid. In the New Testament the feeling of separation is still strong: Christ had to leave His glory to come amongst us; now that He is in glory we must await His coming again, this time bringing His glory with Him. It is John who sweeps all this aside and says, 'He lived among us and we saw in Him the glory of God.'

What pictures are in his mind? A first suggestion may well be the Transfiguration, with the definite allusion in that passage (Mt 17²⁻⁸) to the *Shekinah* and to the Tabernacle. John's Gospel contains no reference to this incident. That vision on the mountain top must have been a crystallization, a flashing conclusion to thoughts and wonderings about their Lord. Was He Elijah, one of the prophets (the promised one 'like unto Moses' of Dt 17¹), or more than a prophet? When 'lifting up their eyes they saw Jesus only,' they were disappointed. Practical Peter had wanted to build a tabernacle to keep the *Shekinah*. John kept it. He had seen the light on the storm-cloud before; he was to see it again and again.

When? Perhaps it was the first thing he ever saw of Jesus. Andrew and he, disciples in those days of the Baptist, had heard him say, 'Behold the Lamb of God,' and followed Jesus. When Jesus turned and asked what they wanted, they were confused and muttered something about 'where was He staying?' Jesus had said, 'Come and ye shall see.' John adds, 'They came and saw'—and stops. What did he see? The poor little house where Jesus was lodging, the group reclining for the evening meal, Jesus taking the bread and breaking it. The flickering lamplight catches His face—and John the dreamer sees the glory his fathers saw in the storm-cloud.

We have something more than conjecture. Notice how often 'glory' and the verb 'glorify'

appear towards the end of John's Gospel. Sometimes the reference is to His pre-existent or risen glory. But there is something else about it even here. The most striking passage is 13³¹ where Jesus uses the word twice, with the verb in different tenses. I am told that we should read, 'Now has the Son of Man just been glorified, and God has just been glorified in Him; and God shall glorify Him in Himself, and straightway shall He glorify Him.' It means, 'You have just seen God's glory and you are just going to see more.' What had they just seen? Judas had eaten the sop and gone out—no glory there, nor any brightness; John says 'and it was night.' Before that, Jesus had laid aside His garments, girded Himself with a towel, taken the place of the slave. As He bent over John's feet His face was in the shadow. When He raised His head and looked at John, John saw the glory which his fathers had seen in the storm-cloud. 'And you are just going to see more.' What were they to see? A dark chill morning; a naked body writhing in the pains of death; vile leering faces all around; the glare of soldiers' torches lighting everything as with the flames of hell. Flames of hell?—As John looked back he saw the lights all change, change to the

light in the storm-cloud over the Tabernacle of God.

In reviewing 'glory' in the New Testament we left out the Book of the Revelation. Here we keep finding similarities of thought which make us call it Johannine in spite of its so different style. Here are angels and archangels, living creatures and a blinding light about the throne—a wealth of piled-up imagery which no artist could paint. It baffles you when you try to think through it visually. But what is the crowning glory of heaven? Listen: 'And I saw in the midst of the throne . . . a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain.'

Some one has said that it is the poorest play which needs the biggest stage and the most varied scenery. Shakespeare needs none of the costumes and lighting effects that you give to a pantomime. He goes on, 'I recall that God gave us His greatest effects on a very small stage, just a strip of eastern country, and a squalid eastern village; and with few properties, only a towel and basin, broken bread and poor wine, four nails and a crown of thorns.'

And yet . . . we did behold His glory.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Swedish Biblical Studies. From Sweden there flows a broad stream of studies in the Biblical field. In that happy land conditions of publication must be far easier than they are in this country, but beyond that there is a zeal that commands warm admiration. Ten of these studies lie before the reviewer. They are for the most part short, but some would justify a fuller notice than can be given here.

There are four studies in the series *Symbolæ Biblicæ Upsalienses*.¹ The first contains a series of short notes on four verses in the Epistle to the Romans, by M. Dibelius, and a most valuable bibliography of publications on both Old and New Testaments during the War years up to the date of its appearance, compiled by Bo Reicke.² The verses dealt with by Dibelius are Ro 5⁶, 12 8¹⁰ and 9³⁰, to the exegesis of which the writer offers contributions. In the bibliography there are inevitably some gaps, particularly where British and American work is concerned, but the reviewer

acknowledges with gratitude its great help to himself in renewing contact with Continental work after the break of the War years. It is simply a list of titles, without indication of the contents, point of view, or quality of the works listed.³

The second and longest of these studies is by E. Lohmeyer, and has for its title *Servant of God and Son of David*.⁴ It studies the passages in the New Testament and in the Didache and 1 Clement where our Lord is called Servant, and then reviews the Gospel traditions in which this concept is enshrined, even where the explicit term is not used. It next turns to the title Son of David, after which it considers the relations between the concept of Servant and that of Messiah and Son of Man. Lohmeyer does not appear to consider the view that the Son of Man in some of the Gospel passages stands for the Kingdom of God, and in general his work leaves out of account the views

¹ This is a series of Supplementary Studies published separately in connexion with the Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok.

² M. Dibelius, *Vier Worte des Römerbriefs*; and Bo Reicke, *Ouvrages de science biblique publiés pendant les années 1940-44*. Together these form No. 3 of the series, dated 1944 (Wretman, Upsala. [Number 4 of the series has not reached the reviewer]).

³ For books on the Old Testament issued during the War years a fuller and annotated list appears in the Book List of the Society for Old Testament Study, 1946 issue, obtainable from Professor G. H. Davies, 3 The Dell, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, price 3s. Many titles in Reicke's list do not appear here, however, and Reicke's list also covers the New Testament.

⁴ *Gottesknecht und Davidsohn* (1945). No. 5 of the series (Ekblad, Västervik, or Munksgaard, Copenhagen).

of others and confines itself to the presentation of his own examination of the evidence. Despite his recognition of the fact that in the Gospels Jesus is never called Son of Man save by Himself, he holds that in the early Christian community the three concepts of Servant, Son of Man, and Messiah continued to exist after the Crucifixion side by side, until the terms Christ and Lord displaced all others. The only passage where Jesus is called Son of Man in the New Testament outside the Gospels is Ac 7⁵⁶, and there is little evidence that this term was ever much used in the Christian community. At the same time the reviewer would stress more than Lohmeyer does that the ideas that were associated with the term Son of Man continued to live in the Early Church, and particularly in connexion with the thought of the Second Coming.

The remaining studies of this series are by Bo Reicke, on *The Jewish 'Damascus Documents', and the New Testament*¹ and by I. Engnell on *Israel and the Law*.² The former consists mainly of a full collection of parallels to the New Testament in the texts best known in this country—though with doubtful appropriateness—as the Zadokite Work. While these parallels have been referred to before, they have nowhere been so carefully collected and indexed as in this brief study. The author does not discuss the date of the texts, save to indicate his rejection of the view that they have anything to do with the followers of John the Baptist,³ and his inclination to a date in the second century B.C. Engnell's study consists of a long and thoroughgoing review of Östborn's *Tora in the Old Testament*, and Danell's *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*. The review is very critical and it shows that within what is sometimes referred to as the 'Upsala School' there are real differences, and that Swedish scholars are more individual than this term would suggest.

There are three studies published by the New Testament Seminary of Upsala. The first⁴ contains some linguistic and textual studies in the New Testament field. Two of these are by H. Riesenfeld, who examines the combination of contradictory terms in the New Testament to express universality, and the word ἀπλῶς in Ja 1⁵. R. Höistad adduces a parallel to 2 Co 6^{3a} from Dio Chrysostom. The editor, A. Fridrichsen, adduces a parallel to 2 Co 4^{8t} from the Corpus Plutarchicum, a note on ἐν δέ in Ph 3¹³, and another on the word ἀσύνθετος; while G. Rudberg offers a study of the word εὐθὺς in Marcan usage. All of these will repay the study of New Testament scholars. The first paper of Riesenfeld's is in French,

occupying nearly half the issue, while the others are all in German. The second issue of this series⁵ contains a brief note on 1 Co 13 by H. Riesenfeld, a Bibliography of the writings of M. Goguel, and a complete index of the first ten issues of the series *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*. The note on 1 Co 13 concerns itself merely with the expression 'men and angels,' and the point of the reference to 'sounding brass' and 'tinkling cymbal.' The third of the publications of the Seminary is a much longer work, by Helge Almqvist, on *Plutarch and the New Testament*.⁶ This contains 329 passages from Plutarch, arranged according to the New Testament order of the passages to which they are parallel, with a symbol prefixed to each to indicate the nature of the parallel suggested. Some of these are stylistic and lexical, while others are in the realm of ideas. There is no attempt to prove any influence of the one on the other, and no claim that Plutarch was acquainted with Christianity. He was contemporary with the writers of the New Testament, however, and while his subject was quite other than theirs, his reflection of the language, ideas, and style of the contemporary Greek world might be expected to illustrate New Testament texts. The study is undertaken as a contribution to a *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*.

The remaining studies are all by Gillis Gerleman, and lie in the Old Testament field. They are also all written in English. The first deals with *Contributions to the Old Testament Terminology of the Chase*.⁷ It notes that in Israel hunting does not appear to have been a sport, but a means of obtaining food, and then examines some of the methods employed. It argues that מִוֶּקֶשׁ was a clap-net, operated by concealed fowlers who closed the net by pulling ropes on a given signal, while פֶּחַ was an automatic trap operated by the prey. In addition the author finds some indication in the Old Testament of the employment of the 'battue' type of hunting, whereby the prey were driven into enclosures. His other two studies are both in the field of the Septuagint, and deal with Job and Chronicles.⁸ These are of high value, and represent a labour out of all proportion to their length. The former examines the style of the translator and his treatment of difficult passages and of passages which offend his sense of propriety, and concludes that the rendering was made before the middle of the second century B.C. for Alexandrian readers by one who was familiar with Greek mythology. There is a chapter on the daughter version in Ethiopic, which modifies the thought of the Greek for theological reasons, and

⁵ *Coniectanea Neotestamentica X* (1946).

⁶ *Plutarch und das Neue Testament: Ein Beitrag zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (1946). Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, xv. Appelberg, Upsala.

⁷ Published in 1946, as *K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse* [1945-6] IV. (Gleerup, Lund).

⁸ *Studies in the Septuagint: I. Book of Job* [1946]; *II. Chronicles* [1946]. (Lund Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, xliii. Nos. 2 and 3. Gleerup, Lund.)

¹ Written in English. No. 6 of the series (Wretman, Upsala).

² Also in English. No. 7 of the series. Both this and the preceding study are dated 1946.

³ Cf. Schousboe's *La secte juive de l'Alliance Nouvelle au pays de Damas et le christianisme naissant*, reviewed in *The Expository Times*, lviii. [1946-7], 54.

⁴ *Coniectanea Neotestamentica IX* (1944). *Seminarium Neotestamenticum Upsaliense*, Geijersgatan 18, Upsala.

especially in the passages that concern the next life. In the study of Chronicles Gerleman rejects the view, first propounded by Grotius and in modern times championed by Torrey, that the Greek version of the book is Theodotion's, and argues that it dates from the second century B.C.

and has an unmistakably Egyptian colouring. He studies in detail its relation to the Greek Penta-teuch and to the parallel texts in the four books of the Reigns. The volume on Job is furnished with an excellent Index.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester.

Contributions and Comments.

Erodis, Prophet and West Africa.

It has often been noticed that the comparison of the two passages Ex 4¹⁴⁻¹⁷ and Ex 7¹ throws light on the function of the prophet. In the first passage, Aaron is described as the mouth of Moses. In the second, the relationship is described as that of God and Prophet, Moses being the god, Aaron the prophet. Thus the prophet is the 'mouth' of God.

It may not be so well known that a similar relationship is found in West Africa. Soon after I first came out here twenty years ago, I had a private visit from a chief. We talked through one of our catechists who acted as interpreter. Shortly afterwards I went to his village about some land allotted to our mission, and on this occasion I was surprised to find that the chief had his interpreter as I had mine. The chief spoke, the 'interpreter' repeated what actually we had all heard, and my catechist turned what he said into French. My replies had to travel the same way. The chief's interpreter did not speak directly to me, nor mine to the chief. This was an official matter and dignities had to be preserved. The chief and I were the important persons, and our words had to be carried in each case by a subordinate who was the mouth. I soon found that this was a common practice. The first idea apparently to the African mind was not the usefulness of an interpreter as such, but as indicating the dignity of the speaker.

Dr. E. W. Smith in his *Aggrey of Africa* tells us that Aggrey's father was hereditary 'Kyiamé' which meant Spokesman or Mouthpiece of the chief. He quotes J. B. Danquah's *Akan Laws and Customs*, pp. 42 ff.: 'The word means he that makes perfect for me. The Kyiamé repeats and perfects what the Chief, who cannot always be an eloquent speaker, may have to say in public.' (This is almost a commentary on Ex 4¹⁰⁻¹⁷.) 'He is a confidential officer whose place is at the Chief's right hand; in the Council and the Court of Judicature it is he who sums up and declares the Chief's will. . . . When he rises to speak in public he leans upon the gold cane or staff of his office, or a subordinate holds it in front of him. He may be sent by the Chief as a plenipotentiary or legate. What he says binds the Chief. . . .'

The 'interpreter' may be important in some ways, but his subordinate position is emphasized

in various ways. In some places he has to prostrate himself before his chief before he speaks. In others, he may only appear before his chief naked from the waist upwards. Recently the subordinate position of an interpreter was shown here in a rather striking fashion. A missionary from Nigeria wished to speak to one of our African ministers, who was formerly one of my students. The missionary could not speak French, and the African could not speak English, so naturally I interpreted. For a few sentences all went well, but suddenly the African stammered and seemed covered with confusion. I asked what was the matter, and he replied that it was not at all right, but shameful that his former professor should act as interpreter to him. He felt that our positions had been wrongly reversed, and he had been given the more important rôle.

I have been asked whether the 'interpreter' had any part in the fetish cults. While in a sense all custom was fetish, yet I am told that the 'interpreter' never had a rôle in purely religious ceremonies.

The mention of the official staff makes one wonder if a staff was not a part of the insignia of a prophet. It figures in the story of Aaron, and Elisha sent his staff by his servant Gehazi to the child of the Shunammite (2 K 4²⁹). It did not work, but evidently Elisha had thought it would. What did Hosea mean when he said that the erring children of Israel sought counsel of wood and their staff declares? It is difficult to draw the line between 'mouth' and messenger, and there is a widespread use of a staff as the sign of a messenger. In the old kingdom of Dahomey, no messenger was accepted as genuine unless he had his staff with him, a staff given by the king.

Again, it may be a coincidence that the most famous 'prophet' of West Africa, Wadé Harris of Liberia who in 1914 went through the Ivory Coast and part of the Gold Coast, carried always a staff. It is true that by tying a small cross-piece at the upper end it took the form of a much elongated cross, but it was definitely a staff. A candidate for baptism knelt and grasped it with both hands. Often converts asked for the staff, and he gave it at once, though he could have shown them that they could make similar ones, for as soon as he had given one away he went into the bush and cut another long cane or stick. He also carried a calabash for baptisms, but I have not heard of any one who asked for that. It was

the cross or staff that the converts wished to keep.

These illustrations are not given as proof of anything in the Old Testament, but as interesting comparisons. There is little or nothing to show that the negro was in the same religious or cultural milieu as the nations of the Old Testament. Anything which Africans say about connexion with Egypt may be dismissed as fancies due to knowledge obtained via Europe. The negro had customs which were handed down, but no historical traditions, at best a memory going back a few generations, not centuries or millennia. He has kept no memory of Egypt, or of being 'a son of Ham'; which of course he isn't. Some anthropologists hold that the negro entered Africa by the north-east and the Bantu by the south-east, but even if that is true, it does not say that the negroes were in the same regions at the same time as the nations of the Old Testament. Negroes were known to the ancient Egyptians and to the Minoans of Crete, but again that does not say that they all had the same remote common culture pattern.

HAROLD GARNER.

*Séminaire Protestant,
Porto Novo, Dahomey,
French West Africa.*

1 Corinthians xiii. 12^a: βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι.

TRANSLATED in R.V., 'For now we see in a mirror darkly,' and by Dr. Moffatt, 'At present we only see the baffling reflections in a mirror,' this sentence is usually explained by the supposed fact that mirrors in the ancient world gave but a distorted reflection. May it not be better understood as an allusion by St. Paul to Plato's famous allegory of the cave (*Republic*, Book VII.)? In this passage Plato likens the ordinary life of men in the world to that of a number of persons chained from their birth in a subterranean cavern, with their backs to the entrance of the cavern, and a fire behind them between which and the prisoners runs a roadway, flanked by a wall high enough to conceal the persons who pass along the road, while it allows the shadows of things which they carry upon their heads to be thrown by the fire upon the wall of the cavern facing the prisoners. For these prisoners shadows, vague and fleeting, constitute their nearest approach to reality. They see only 'baffling reflections in a mirror,' and the real nature of things as they are in themselves is hidden from their sight. Should one of the prisoners be released from his chains and turned to the light, *i.e.* towards the objects themselves, he will then see them 'face to face'; he will realize also the truth about life on earth of which, up till now, he has been largely ignorant.

If St. Paul had this analogy in mind, the generally accepted interpretation of this verse is not altered; but it is, I suggest, made more obvious. Like the cave-dwellers in their gloomy prison, we can have on earth only an inkling of

ultimate reality, hints and suggestions 'like in pattern to the time.' Not until we pass from this life into the clearer light of the life beyond, shall we begin to apprehend truth as it is or understand the nature and purpose of our earthly existence.

A. S. PERRY.

Caterham, Surrey.

A Papyrus Fragment of the *Acta Pauli*.

SINCE the Michigan papyrus fragment P. Mich. Inv. 3788 was published in 1943 by H. A. Sanders in *The Harvard Theological Review* (vol. xxxvi.), where it is described as of 'an homiletic or interpretive character,' it has been the subject of two notes in *The Journal of Theological Studies* (vol. xlvii, pp. 56-7 and pp. 196-9). In the more recent of these notes the text on the recto of the papyrus has been identified as part of the *Acta Pauli*, but 'the text on the verso,' the writers, G. D. Kilpatrick and C. H. Roberts, add, 'is not extant in any MS. of the *Acta*.'

The verso text consists of some nine lines, all in a very fragmentary condition, but the last four lines afford a clue for the identification of the passage. The lines, with some restorations suggested by the editors, are:

θαν]μαζετε ο[τι
νεκρο]υς ποιω ανα[στηναι
λ]επρους καθ[αριζω
]παρалуτου[ς θεραπευω.

This passage is absent from the Coptic version as edited from the Heidelberg papyrus by Carl Schmidt in his *Acta Pauli* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1905), but on a folio of his manuscript which Schmidt regarded as a fragment of an uncanonical Gospel and therefore printed separately (text, pp. 55*-6*; tr., pp. 237-8) we may identify the text of the Coptic corresponding to the Greek of our papyrus fragment. This is evident from the following translation of the Coptic. The rendering adopted is that of M. R. James (*Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 31), who follows Schmidt in regarding the leaf as a Gospel fragment; words which are editorial restorations have been indicated by italics.

Why marvel ye that I raise
the dead, or that I make the lame
to go, or that I cleanse the lepers
or raise up the sick, or that I have
healed the palsied . . . ?

This identification, with Schmidt's observation (*A. P.*, p. 236) that the script and language are uniform throughout the manuscript, enables us to restore the text of the folio to the Coptic *Acta Pauli*. And it throws light on the question of the interpretation of the Michigan fragment, for the words, in the Coptic version, are put into the mouth of Jesus, which makes it very probable that He, and not Paul, is the speaker in the Greek.

W. D. McHARDY.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

Colonial Failure.

A quite extraordinarily frank, and very serious, criticism of the whole administrative policy, and the condition of the people, in our Province of Nigeria is made in a book entitled, *Have We Failed in Nigeria?* (Lutterworth Press; 6s. net). The author is Dr. Walter R. Miller, who has served for forty years in the Province as doctor, missionary, and teacher. He has occupied a highly honourable place in the community, and his book is introduced with approval by the well-known administrator and educationist, A. G. Fraser, a weighty commendation for any book.

The entire life of the Province is passed in review, and the strictures he passes on it are so severe and so far-reaching that the authorities at home are bound to take notice of them. It will be sufficient for the purpose of this short review to quote some of Dr. Miller's own words.

'The failure of the Administration—in which every European and every educated African is involved—has been great. In education, in the application of medical science, in agriculture, in the rule of the people, in the use of the great resources of the country, in the practical stamping out of diseases, due to parasites and dirt in village and town, and in raising the social and economic life of the people: upon all these honest criticism, while giving credit where due, must nevertheless to-day give a verdict of almost entire failure.'

'An administrator in Nigeria, who arrived almost at the top of the political tree, told me that if you kept the country quiet and stirred up no dust, wrote a good annual report of the condition of the Province which you administered, however bad it might have been, and concluded with the formula, "The relationship between the Government and the Native Administration has been all that could be desired," then you were sure of promotion.'

'In the life of Nigeria to-day is seen a reproduction of competition on the European pattern—combines and cartels grow and strangle the community. Debt, bribery, and corruption are almost universal. Even soldiers' wives have had to pay to get their allotment cards, or money, or even letters from their husbands.'

'Side by side with a local press of varying standards of ability, truth, and decency, will be found Courts of Justice (or injustice) which would make the worst records of bribery and corruption blush. . . . The poor in the towns, the villages, and in the agricultural community suffer most in this way. . . . When a plaintiff does not bribe well his case is liable to be held up interminably. If his case has been directed against a rich or powerful personage the poor man will have little chance.'

'Within a mile of where I am writing there is a small town-police force totally inadequate to the large district which they have to control. The town itself is usually in a filthy condition, and during the rains is positively pestilential. The

town chief has lately been congratulated, decorated, and had his status and pay increased. Here are crowded together, with no drainage system, no decent water, and little sanitary precaution, a small number of respectable tailors, traders, artisans, etc., doing a hard day's work for very poor pay. In addition there are pagan and "Christian" (!) prostitutes in crowds drawn from all the eastern parts of Nigeria to what *has* been a recruiting centre for soldiers. There are men here who know nothing of trades like carpentry or masonry but call themselves "contractors," which is a euphemism for "swindlers."

These extracts are taken from different parts of Dr. Miller's book. Similar denunciations are directed against education administration, the Church and medical care. It must not be supposed that Dr. Miller is blind to the good achieved. He makes handsome acknowledgment of what has been done that is positively beneficial. But the picture suggested by the extracts given above is painted again and again in every sphere. Is there an answer to these scathing strictures? If so, it is important that it should be given. Dr. Miller is no mere tourist, but a man who has given his powers to the country and loves the people and is loved by them. He cannot be ignored.

F. J. RAE.

A Nature-Book.

'The Song of Songs is the one originally secular book in the Old Testament, and fortunately it is also a Nature-book. Its anthology of love-lyrics is partly set in descriptions of natural scenery. It names a score of plants or trees and a dozen animals. The erotic use of some of these references to Nature accompanies a real appreciation of natural beauty, such as the coming of the flowers and the singing of the birds in the spring, the dove in the clefts of the rock or by pools of water, the sheaf of yellow wheat in its circle of henna flowers, and the red hyacinth against a background of thistles, the flock of goats streaming down the mountain-side, the shorn and newly washed sheep in their white freshness, the young gazelles pasturing among the hyacinths, the spring of water in the garden, the waving fronds of the palm tree, the horizontal foliage of the cedars of Lebanon, the blossom of the pomegranate, the scented apples and the pleasant shade of the apple-tree, the greenness of the nut-garden, the budding of the vines and their full clusters, the glory of the dawn and the beauty of the moon, the sky-line of Carmel, the grace and beauty of the human body in man and woman.'

¹ H. Wheeler Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, 4 f.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.